

Mr. CONNALLY. For the present, I object.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, if the Senator wants to make that the rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said that for the present I should object. If the Senator wants to renew his request later, I may change my opinion, but I do not have time to read the letter now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo H. Thebaud to be rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bertram J. Rodgers to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley D. Jupp to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTER—ST. MARYS, PA.

Mr. BARKLEY. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has asked, and in his behalf I present the request, that the nomination of Dennis H. Phelan to be postmaster at St. Marys, Pa., reported today by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, be submitted to the Senate for present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Pennsylvania spoke to me

about the action of the committee, which was favorable and unanimous, and I have no objection to the present consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 25, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James W. Johnson, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York, in place of Joseph T. Higgins, resigned.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Office of Price Administration, vice Prentiss M. Brown.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John J. Haggerty, of Maryland, to be comptroller, Post Office Department, vice William L. A. Slattery.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Carl H. Jones, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of October 1942.

Capt. Samuel P. Ginder, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of December 1942.

Capt. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1943.

Capt. Cortlandt C. Baughman, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, naval operating base, Londonderry, Ireland, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. Benjamin V. McCandlish, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Moroccan sea frontier, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. Campbell D. Edgar, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, transports, Amphibious Force, northwest African waters, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. George H. Mills, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Commander Fleet Airships, Atlantic, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. Byron McCandless, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list for temporary service, while serving as commandant, Naval Repair Base, San Diego, Calif., to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

Capt. William M. Quigley, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander advanced bases, Solomon Islands, to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

Capt. Wallace B. Phillips, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander of the Rear Echelon, Fifth Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet, to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

Capt. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as a submarine task force commander, to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Graves B. Erskine to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service, from the 19th day of September 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 25, 1943:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Leo H. Thebaud

To be commodores

Bertram J. Rodgers

Stanley D. Jupp

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Harold B. Penne	Guy B. Mayo
Arthur K. Bourret	Harry Feehan
Harold E. Allen	Richard Q. Lewis
Harry D. Pratt	Cleveland C. Barry
Arthur F. Wilson, Jr.	William E. Collier
Warren B. Capron	Richard B. Smith
Luther A. Bookout	George E. Lawrence
Theodore D. Vreeland	Ralph E. Knight, Jr.
Raymond S. McFall	William A. Barry
Edward D. Miller, Jr.	Arthur E. Isensee
Edward H. Stauffer	John R. Gibney
Robert K. West	Charles H. Booth
Jack P. Stone	

POSTMASTER

PENNSYLVANIA

Dennis A. Phelan, St. Marys.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." Stay Thou our faith on the word of Thy Prophet, we beseech Thee, Almighty God. Whenever a flood of great sorrows is the work of evil, with all its perilous and uncontrolled waters which arise in a nation's experience, O Master, break through all mental delusions, strive with divided purposes and defeat mistaken ambitions. Bless Thou richly, dear Lord, our most honorable Speaker and the Congress; grant that all labors shall bear the mark

of unity and a wise consideration of our fellow countrymen.

God be merciful unto us and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth; Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase and God, even our own God, shall bless us; God shall bless us and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 21, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1225. An act granting a pension to Constance Eager;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; and

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

LXXXIX—548

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit tomorrow morning until 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 330) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 763, amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

OCTOBER 21, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Roads.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE E. OUTLAND.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF OYSTERS FROM THE WATERS OF YORK RIVER AND QUEEN CREEK, VA.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2886) to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other

purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "season", insert "": *Provided*, That there shall be no appropriation hereunder for liquidation of damages to owners or others."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what this amendment does?

Mr. BLAND. I think it prevents any individual claim for oysters or things of that kind. The theory of the bill as originally presented was to acquire the oysters that were damaged, but I think this amendment was placed in the bill because of the fear that it might recognize an individual claim for oysters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This amendment will ban any individual claims against the Government?

Mr. BLAND. I was afraid it might interfere with the proposed plan. I submitted the matter to the Navy Department and they assured me that the amendment is in conformity with their plan. I would not say it would prohibit a man from at any time making a claim against the Government. It would be under this bill. Every individual has a right to make a claim if he wants to. I guess if he was my constituent I would probably put in a bill if I thought he made a good case. But this is a very serious situation which it is hoped will be worked out in this way, that the Navy has an arrangement whereby it will itself or through some organization it forms purchase the oysters that are now salable and are going to die, thus not approaching it as a proposal to save an individual or pay him damages but to save a supply of oysters badly needed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We have already passed the bill. What I am trying to get at is exactly what this amendment does.

Mr. BLAND. It is restrictive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a restrictive amendment?

Mr. BLAND. Entirely so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I recall when this bill was here before, but I do not understand what the gentleman is trying to do unless it is that he is trying to purchase these oysters at Government expense. If that is the purpose, why not go up in our country, and why are not our farmers saved from this loss they are sustaining day after day when the Government interferes with their production?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman asked me that question before, and I told him I would gladly go along with him if he could find some way. This is worked out by the Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our crops are ruined because they take all the men away. The farmers cannot harvest the crops. For example, the apples fall on the ground

and cannot be used, the grapes cannot be harvested, and all those things, but nobody pays our farmers. Is this because these are oysters and because they are south of the Potomac?

Mr. BLAND. No; not that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not that?

Mr. BLAND. They are south of the York River. I presume some of the men are there. The lands are lands from which under the laws of the State of Virginia oysters may not be removed, because they come in a contaminated area. They come in this contaminated area because the Navy established a Seabee camp there, and the waters of this area are polluted because of their proximity to this camp of 85,000 men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this in the area where the Government is purchasing this overflowed land up in New Jersey at a cost of some \$2,000,000 to establish this camp, from the Hague interests?

Mr. BLAND. No. The testimony before our committee was that there was no other situation of this kind in the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suppose you will get it all anyway, so I do not see any use to object.

Mr. BLAND. No, I will not get it all, but I would like to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post of October 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include the text of a radio interview on the subject of aviation legislation by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Miami (Fla.) Chamber of Commerce, on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Green Bay Press-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Lorain Journal of October 22, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the same paper of different date, October 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a part of a broadcast by Mr. Philip Keyne Gordon on October 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and read a brief editorial appearing in one of my local newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The editorial is as follows:

The farmers all got checks Saturday from the Government. There was no explanation of what the checks were for. The best explanation the bank here could give them was: "It must be corn money."

One of Mr. Morgenthau's secretaries must have forgotten to enclose the picture of F. D. R. and the reminder about the election in November 1944. Bill Bunting says he shook his envelope vigorously and no campaign literature (other than the check) fell out.

The farmers are trying to figure whether the payment was for corn they raised or for corn they didn't raise.

BEEF AND BEEF CATTLE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article entitled "City Woman Feeds Her Family," by Miss Rachael Reed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on silver, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the National Lawyers Guild protesting the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee in voting a subsidy ban.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS MILITARY SUPPLIES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] be permitted to extend his remarks to include a copy of a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests to extend my remarks in the RECORD; in one to include an editorial; in another to include a newspaper article; and in the other to include a resolution adopted by A. F. of L. unions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a letter received from Mr. Boling, of the Feed Industry Council, and findings and recommendations of the council with respect to grain feed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Director of Economic Stabilization is reported to have on his desk at this moment an order which would in effect establish a price ceiling on live cattle. Such a price ceiling is absolutely unworkable and could not accomplish any beneficial results. It could only add to the multiplying difficulties of the producer. We are told that the purpose of ceilings is to protect the consumer. The consumer is protected by wholesale and retail ceilings. Those are the only ceilings that are effective, as far as the consumer is concerned. It, therefore, seems to me rather a strained procedure to establish an additional ceiling on the live animals and claim that it is for the benefit of the consumer. The consumer is interested in the ceiling on beef and not upon live cattle. But, if ceilings are established on the price of live cattle there will be one more deterrent factor to be overcome by any would-be cattle producer. I do not know how much more Government interference the producer is going to accept and remain a producer. He is confronted with enough difficulties already. He has suffered a 20 to 25 percent loss in the value of his cattle since the roll-back subsidy went into effect. This of itself is calculated to put thousands of cattle growers out of business, but at least the consumer was promised a lower price as a result. In this case, however, there is not even any promise of relief for the consumer—simply a new burden

on the producer which is certain in the long run to result in less beef. In behalf of the consumers of beef as well as of the producers of cattle, I urge Judge Vinson to prevent this useless gesture of bureaucracy at its worst.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include an article in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the regular business of the day and following the special orders already granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOPE was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, following what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just said, I wish to call attention to the fact that the O. P. A. is getting ready to deal another blow to the beef-cattle producers of this country. A few weeks ago it put into effect a price roll-back and subsidy program which resulted in the packers getting the subsidy and the producer getting the roll-back. This program was put into effect against the advice and over the opposition of every element of the livestock industry. The ultimate effect of this roll-back program is going to be less meat at the time of the greatest demand in our history from our armed forces, our allies, and our domestic consumers.

Not satisfied with the damage already done, the O. P. A. is now planning to submit to the Stabilization Director a plan to put ceilings on live cattle. I am advised that there is not a single person connected with the livestock industry in any of its phases in this country who thinks that the plan will work. I think I am justified in saying that the Food Administrator does not believe it will work. It is being put into effect without any consultation with livestock producers and its ultimate effect will be a further decrease in the amount of meat available for war and civilian purposes.

RUBBER TO SWEDEN

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have not heard very much about crude rubber for a long time. All kinds of interesting things have been pushed in front of it. However, in the November Farm Journal appears the following:

RUBBER TO SWEDEN

The Toledo Times carried an article the first week in October, under the heading "Big rubber cargo arrives in Sweden." The article related that the motorship *Mindora* had arrived in neutral Sweden with 172 tons of crude rubber from the United States; that it was the first time since March 1942 that Sweden had received rubber from any source.

Is it true that we are exporting rubber at a time when we are being asked to conserve? And is there any chance that this rubber might be reshipped from neutral Sweden to Germany?

I think it would be a very good idea if we found out whether we are shipping crude rubber to Sweden.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution by the National Association of Assessing Officers and an address by the county auditor of Hamilton County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests: First, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the railway clerks' organization, and the other is to extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address given by our colleague the gentleman from Indiana, GERALD W. LANDIS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be transferred to Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. ARTHUR GRUENERT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DAVE E. SATTERFIELD 3D

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the House reads stories every day of the courage and determination of our American soldiers and sailors, but it is very seldom that those accounts of courage come close to home, and I want to briefly recite something that happened in the south Pacific in connection with the recent naval attack on Wake Island, during which a certain aviation officer of the Navy took off from a carrier, came in low, and strafed Wake Island, at which time he was hit by a Japanese bullet in the leg, that went through his knee and up into the groin and inflicted a very serious wound.

Further, Japanese bullets knocked out the hydrostatic system of his plane and punctured the gasoline tank. Finding himself under those difficulties, this man tied up his own wounds so he would not bleed to death, flying the disabled plane, and flew it for 45 minutes back to the deck of the carrier, where he landed it without a crash.

That boy was the son of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Church Federation of Los Angeles; also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include

therein a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

COLORADO, ITS MOUNTAIN BEAUTY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, a thorough research has been made by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as well as by other Democratic members of the committee on the function and purpose of this committee.

It was found that this committee has definite functions to perform, namely, the subject included in the name of this committee. Because of the insistence of certain of the senior members on this committee, of the majority party, it has been allowed to become atrophied. Today we are attempting to inject new life into the activities of this committee and again we find that the same persons are working to block such movements. If they are successful, I see no occasion to continue this committee, and I think it would be appropriate that the balance of the members resign, because if we are accountable for a responsibility, we should accept that responsibility and not continue as a committee in name only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FLOESER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and to include therein a number of newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROBLEMS OF THE CATTLE PRODUCERS

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great Corn Belt section and cattle-feeding country and have in my district many producers of cattle feeds and the finished product. As the cattle come from the ranges we finish them on corn.

Large production of grain was lost this past year because of bad handling of rationing by people who were not familiar

with the industry. Had the machinery manufacturers been allowed to handle the program, men who know more about it than anyone else, we would have had much more production of grain in the Grain Belt.

O. P. A. now proposes to fix price ceilings on different grades of cattle. This I am sure is going to be disastrous to the production of meat in this country. There are no more patriotic people than the farmers, the food producers, and the cattle producers of the great West, Southwest, and Northwest. They know more about this subject than anyone else and should be consulted. The question should at least come before the House Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRICE CEILINGS ON CATTLE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the matter presented by many Members with reference to the approaching fixation of a live price ceiling on cattle is of great concern to me; it is of great concern to the country. It presents fairly the question of whether or not we are going to be called upon to exist upon red tape or red meat as the central basis of diet for the American people.

I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Agriculture call the O. P. A. heads before it and insist that they show cause and reason for this beyond the mere desire to harass and create greater confusion. There can be no reason for it. I know from more than 40 years' experience in the beef-cattle business that it will not work except to destroy an essential food commodity not only for the people of this Nation but our soldiers and our allies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that within the last 30 minutes five Members, notwithstanding that the price of cattle has reached the highest level it has ever reached in this country, namely, 16 cents per pound on the hoof, complain bitterly because it is contemplated that the Office of Price Administration will place the long-delayed ceiling on the price of cattle.

Mr. Speaker, in this country today we have 15,000,000 more head of cattle than ever before in history,

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot, I only have a minute.

Notwithstanding this increased number of head, charges are made that we shall be short of meat. It is charged that the farmers who are feeders are holding their cattle off the market and doing so in order to obtain a still higher price. One of the Members stated that the placing of a price ceiling on cattle will not help the consumer. That statement appears ridiculous to me. I presume it would help the consumer if the price of meat were lowered after the price of cattle had been permitted to go higher and higher.

As to the farmers: I sympathize, of course, with them. The gentleman from Ohio complained that they received many checks from the Government and many did not know what the checks were for. Is it possible that the farmers complain because a letter did not accompany the checks urging that they be cashed, or can it be that they want the Government to send them cold cash instead of checks? I concede the statements as to the patriotism of the farmers, but it appears to me that their spokesmen are placing them in an extremely selfish position by continuously urging and demanding that they receive higher and higher prices for all of their products. This morning we hear complaints about a ceiling on cattle and for days we have heard complaints about the ceiling on hogs. Potato growers in featured advertisements oppose the ceiling on potatoes and we read of the demand of the dairymen for higher ceilings on their products.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether these farmer spokesmen have ever given the slightest thought to the consumer and, as our former colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, would say, in questioning appropriations, "Where will we get the money?" applies to the already overburdened consumer in meeting the increased cost of living and paying additional and higher taxes. Where will he get the money if prices go higher and additional taxes are imposed?

While we have raised a 10-percent greater crop this year than in 1942 and the indications are we will still further increase production in 1944, the professional farm leaders persist that we must not put any ceilings on farm products because it would eliminate the incentive to grow larger crops in 1944. Even with the prevailing prices there should be no fear of any shortage next year—leave it to the farmers—they will raise as large a crop as is possible in view of these high prices. Instead of higher prices the gentlemen would be doing the farmers a real service if they would urge them not to pay the doubled and trebled prices for additional acreage to the banks and insurance companies which the latter obtained for little or nothing through foreclosures in 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that from time to time I call attention to the consumer, especially the 22,000,000 whose earnings and incomes are below \$1,000 a year, who have no lobbyists here because they are

unorganized. There is truly an unfortunate condition in contrast to the farm blocs and other groups.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

CATTLE PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the cattle rancher from Chicago, I want to say there is nothing surer than a desperate meat shortage in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to a Member as the "gentleman from Chicago." The Chair has ruled heretofore that that is not a proper designation for a Member.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair so rules again.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at a livestock auction in southeastern Pennsylvania the other day, where normally the sale is over at 4 o'clock, it took until 4 o'clock to dispose of the pigs. Pigs that 6 months ago brought from \$6 to \$8 each sold at from 60 cents to \$2 each because of the corn situation. You have to become a criminal to buy corn on the market today. There is none in that country and, I repeat, nothing is surer than a desperate meat shortage.

This morning's papers came out again advertising the sale of another long and well-established Holstein herd in my district, consisting of 75 head of Holstein cows now in the hands of a rich man who finds it impossible to carry on. When the Morgenthau type and these other rich men cannot carry on in this industry, how in the name of God can the average farmer get along, and where is the meat coming from?

The best safeguard against inflation is a generous supply of consumer goods. By all means the administration should make it possible for the farmers to produce. Right now the hens would be laying more eggs and turkeys would gain weight much more rapidly if corn would be available. There is plenty of corn in the country, but the O. P. A. makes it impossible for it to flow into the channels of trade.

THE CATTLE SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, none of us need worry overmuch about the welfare of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

SABATH] who has just addressed us in opposition to the five Members who demanded a fair price for the farmer. I regret to refer to his appearance, I do it with reluctance, but may I say he gives every appearance of never having suffered, never having in any way suffered, because of a lack of meat, so he should not be unduly concerned because the farmers have now a chance of getting the cost of production. They will carry on just the same as they have in the past, ever feeding the people in the cities, of whom the gentleman is one.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, just told us of the incident of a Wisconsin couple who would not come to Washington to be received at the White House and there receive a medal awarded to a son who gave his life to the country because they wanted to save their money to buy War bonds and stamps. May I say that attitude is typical of all our people in the Middle West. Contrast it with the attitude of some folks here in Washington. This morning a member of the Committee on Printing advises us that in a certain Government bureau here the employees spent 8,000 man-hours looking at the film pictures of Mrs. Roosevelt on her last trip to the war front. Eight thousand hours! Eight thousand man-hours—all paid for by taxation—was that productive employment?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in regard to the ceiling price on live cattle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an extract from an address made by Watson Thomson, on the subject of the Jews in Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the president of the Civil Service Commission on Federal employment in the State of South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Columbus Day speech made by a Legionnaire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DANGEROUS STATEMENTS OF WENDELL L. WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my sympathies to the Republican Members of this House.

A few nights ago Wendell L. Willkie, continuing his operations in the Republican "china shop," came to Washington and made some of the most offensive and dangerous statements to Allied unity that have ever been made by any man parading as a public figure.

The statements he made about our two chief allies were undoubtedly known to them within less than 2 hours.

It is fortunate that Cordell Hull is in Europe at this time for he can assure both Russia and Great Britain, and all the rest of our allies, that Wendell L. Willkie speaks only for himself when he makes such reckless statements as he made here the other night.

We care nothing about Mr. Willkie's slurring attacks on us southern Democrats or his offensive references to the white people of the South generally. The more he attacks us the stronger we get.

But when he comes here and makes statements, such as he made the other night, that were offensive to our principal allies and dangerous to Allied unity at this critical time, I say that I am glad we have a man like Cordell Hull in Europe to let the heads of those governments know that Mr. Willkie speaks for nobody but himself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TIRE RATIONING

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a letter from a soldier who has lost a leg in north Africa. He is back home and is trying to get to and from his job. All four tires on his 1936 model Ford are blown out. Under the present rules he cannot get any tires for his automobile. Our new O. P. A. Administrator, Mr. Chester Bowles, should give consideration to such cases, and take care of these servicemen immediately upon their return. When a serviceman who has served this country comes back here wanting a job, secures same, and drives several miles in order to perform same, he certainly is entitled to the tires needed for his transportation necessary to earning a livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to read his letter which is as follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1943.

Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: I am writing you to see if you could be of assistance to me in helping get some casings for my car. It is 1938 Ford, uses 600 x 16, and the casings are all blown out at this time. The local board here says there is no way they can give me tires as I have only an A book.

Mr. WICKERSHAM, I lost a leg in north Africa on November 12. I have an artificial leg but it is unhandy and hurts me considerable to do much walking. I am on a 60-day furlough, have 30 days yet. I am unassigned to any company at this time and am still a patient. I have been working at the farmers elevator in Hobart, and have to have some way to get to and from work. My father lives 6 miles northwest of Hobart, and I am staying at his place, and naturally I do want to do some going which I believe I am entitled to do.

As I have only been out of the hospital since September 22, Mr. WICKERSHAM, I realize that gasoline and tires are scarce, and don't think that the Government owes me anymore than anyone else, but do feel like I am entitled to necessary transportation, and cannot go at this time on casings I have. I have tried to do something in line of work of some kind ever since I got out of the hospital, and want to continue to try to do something. That is the reason I am calling on you to do what you can in this matter. Thanking you for whatever you can do to assist me in getting some tires, I am,

Yours truly,

CORP. FLOYD L. MCELREATH,
Borden General Hospital,
Chickasha, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WENDELL L. WILLKIE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say for the benefit of the Members of the House that the Republican Members, with the possible exception of half a dozen, concur most heartily in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I am surprised that JOHN would take Mr. Willkie seriously, this hybrid mongrel of Socialist, Democrat, Republican, new dealer, and world traveler, who in 49 days discovered the answers to all the questions in all the countries of the world. Mr. Willkie is a self-made man, and God how he loves his maker! No one listens to Mr. Willkie because all the hot air he spews forth is just some more campaign oratory. Only one other man can match him in colossal conceit and fast footwork.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

TAXES AND TAX SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2199) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I observe that these bills have all had the unanimous action of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but I would ask the chairman of the committee to explain these bills, four in number.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois says, the full District Committee has acted in unanimous accord in presenting these measures to the House. H. R. 2199 is a bill which would amend our present act relating to taxes and tax sales within the District of Columbia.

Under existing law, when taxes on real property in the District of Columbia are in arrears, the property is sold to the highest bidder and a tax-sale certificate issued to him. The purpose of the measure we present today is to provide means whereby this cloud upon the title may be removed by paying to the Collector of Taxes for the legal holder of the tax-sales certificate the amount for which the property was sold, exclusive of surplus, plus interest thereon for the first 2 years after the date of such certificate at the rate of 12 percent per annum and for 3 years thereafter at the rate of 6 percent per annum.

The bill also provides that, when the property is so redeemed, the Collector of Taxes shall notify the owner of record of such tax-sale certificate by registered mail at his last known address, and, if the owner of such tax-sale certificate

fails to apply for that money within a period of 5 years, it accrues to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I observe that the Committee on the District of Columbia has been given every opportunity to bring up legislation as quickly as possible after it is reported out of the committee. The leadership on both sides of the aisle has cooperated to the fullest extent possible with the chairman and the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia in seeing that legislation reported out received prompt consideration. As a matter of fact, the leadership has enabled the legislation to be brought up where it was reported out unanimously without the committee's being compelled to wait until the regular District of Columbia day. Further, I think the business in order on District of Columbia day has been dispensed with as little delay during the last 2 or 3 years as during any similar period.

The leadership on both sides recognizes that while we are Members of Congress we are also members of the legislative body of the District of Columbia and that that is quite a serious trust. We want to see that the people of the District receive as prompt consideration in the passage of legislation as possible. We want the Congress and the legislative body of the District to convey to the people of the District of Columbia and the city of Washington that knowledge so that they may have confidence in the fact that Congress as a legislative body is legislating as quickly as possible.

The chairman of the committee and all of the members are aware of that fact. That condition will continue as long as I am leader, but I am very much concerned about the constant tendency and effort on the part of some individuals, and particularly one of your newspapers—and I speak frankly and impersonally—to bring about a misunderstanding between the people of the District and the Members of Congress. We should have confidence in one another and respect for one another. I think that instead of trying to bring misunderstandings that they should attempt to bring about a feeling of confidence and understanding. Certainly, the Congress during the past 3 years, and I am confining myself to that period only, has done everything in its power to convey to the people of the District of Columbia the fact that we recognize our trust, and are legislating just as quickly as is humanly possible, even not compelling the committee to wait until its regular District day, in order to get legislation through which relates to the District. I think it only fair to make these observations so that in the future, instead of trying to bring about a feeling of misunderstanding, that a feeling of confidence and understanding, which the action of the Members of Congress justifies, would be a better course to pursue.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the observations of the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts are well timed. I think, without any disparagement to the leadership either Democratic or Republican in the past years in this House, that the present leadership on both sides of the aisle has attempted in every possible way to cooperate with the House District Committee in the expeditious consideration of legislation. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the ranking minority member, joins me in that comment on the very pertinent remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the people of the District of Columbia and the Congress have not been able to get along as friendly as we all desire, I do not believe it can be charged to the District Committee of the House, because it seems to me they have at all times been endeavoring to smooth out any fancied difficulty. Of course there is one thing that we perhaps would miss, if all of our difficulties were wiped out. During my short stay here, I have been entertained as well as amused on several occasions by visiting at the homes of friends here in the District, and when neighbors came in, not being introduced as a Congressman, it has been my privilege to get the opinion of some of the neighbors of Congressmen and their lack of ability and their disregard of District interests. That is really very amusing and very instructive, and so I hope that no serious difficulties will continue, and that we will always be free to get the opinion the people have of us, having expressed that opinion when they did not know that we are around. It is so conducive to harmonious action.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, I am pleased to yield again.

Mr. McCORMACK. The observations of the gentleman from Michigan are correct. The District of Columbia Committee has done a wonderful job, and I am very glad that I agree with my friend from Michigan, whom I personally like. My observation was not made for the purpose of controversy, but in the hope that a better understanding would develop.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I concur in the remarks of the two gentlemen just preceding me, but I do call attention to the way this bill is drafted. The bill provides as follows:

That an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by inserting in section 3 thereof immediately preceding the word "Provided" where the same first appears in said section the following:

Would it not be preferable for the District Committee to bring in a bill drafted in accordance with the Ramseyer rule?

It appears to me, that it is rather involved for a Member on the floor to digest quickly just what is desired in a measure such as this.

Does the gentleman object to offering an amendment to this bill embodying the suggestion which I have made, and which will require no additional work, but will clarify the matter?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, of course, not only I, but I am sure all Members of the House have a very genuine respect for the legislative ability of our distinguished colleague from Michigan, especially in view of the fact that for many years he has served as a member of the Rules Committee and he goes into the intricacies of bill drafting perhaps to a greater degree than some of the other Members of this body. I should like in this instance, to simply say to the gentleman that the measure in the first instance was proposed by the corporation counsel, acting in behalf of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia. It is my understanding, although I may be in error, that in the drafting of proposed legislation which is sent here and which clears through the office of the Speaker and has been sent to our committee, the legislative drafting service is called into consultation. I shall investigate that further to see if I have made a correct statement.

I feel that in connection with this bill, if the gentleman will be kind enough to allow its passage in the way it is presented, I can assure him on behalf of myself as an individual, and more particularly on behalf of the District Committee, that we will observe the suggestion which he has made, to a more marked degree in the future.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. This piece of legislation, as the gentleman knows, is highly technical in character, and is so construed, so as to protect the rights of the legal owner of the equity in the property. I notice on page 2, in line 6, there is a provision for the redemption of the certificate by paying to the collector of taxes for the legal holder of the certificate the amount for which it was sold at such sale, exclusive of surplus. Will the gentleman explain for the purpose of the record just what is meant by the words "exclusive of surplus," and what meaning is to be attached to that?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I might reply that an answer could be made in several ways. I will transfer the inquiry to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as he is a member of our subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee which had this legislation under careful study and consideration and reported it to the full committee. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois might desire to make answer.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that the record may be clear in the matter, as I understand it, in the District of Columbia, delinquent taxes are offered for sale to the highest bidder, are they not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is the present law.

Mr. KEEFE. Quite unlike the law in my State where they are purchased by the municipality, and they got rid of that idea of having a lot of people come in and bid for these tax certificates.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There has been a bad practice existing in the District, as the gentleman says.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, if such a sale is held and a desirable tax certificate is offered for sale, it might be that it will be bid above the actual amount of taxes due, in which case there would be a surplus. Is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. So that upon redemption, the owner of the property could actually redeem it by paying the exact amount of the taxes, without being compelled to pay the surplus created through the excessive bidding. Is that the way I understand the situation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I answered the gentleman frankly.

Mr. KEEFE. I will defer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to make that explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might confess that we have a very archaic tax-sale system in the District of Columbia. If there is any jurisdiction in the United States where there is no justification for a system whereby property is put on the block for open competitive bidding, this would be that one jurisdiction, because the District of Columbia in times of emergency, can obtain necessary funds from the Federal Treasury on a loan basis. But as the situation stands today, tax buyers from other sections of the country, notably New York, Philadelphia, and other cities, come down to Washington at the appropriate time and they purchase by bid the desirable properties and all the cats and dogs revert to the District of Columbia itself. Consequently, when they bid over and above the amount of the taxes, they are entitled, under existing law, to draw interest thereon, but certainly we do not want to penalize the owners of the property who can redeem property and make them pay an amount that carries a surplus over and above the actual amount of the tax. And it was that section that refers to the surplus as being over and above the amount of the tax that is in question.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. This proposed legislation further provides that the owner of the property may redeem the same by paying the amount of the tax, plus interest, to the collector of taxes "who shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, notify the owner of record of such tax sale certificate at his last known address," and so on.

Now in view of the fact that legislation of this character is very technically construed by the courts and every intentment is made in favor of the owner of the property, why has not the committee specifically provided that the collector's certificate specify the time or times given to the owners of the property or the owners of the tax certificate

that the owner of the property has the right to redeem the same by paying the collector the amount due plus the interest and state the amount that is available, and that he should surrender his certificate, because who is going to determine what is a reasonable time under the circumstances? Is it 5 days, 10 days, 20 days, 30 days, 60 days, or what?

May I ask if the gentleman from West Virginia would consider an amendment that would be specific in character, and requiring the collector to serve notice upon the owner of the tax certificate within 5 days; then there can be no question about it, and there should be no litigation arising as to that particular omission or failure on the part of the tax collector to serve notice within a time within which the holder of the tax certificate thought was, perhaps, unreasonable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin raises a pertinent suggestion and, as far as I am individually concerned, I think the proper procedure would be to have a certain limitation of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is an operating detail of the assessor's office, where that matter is taken care of, and insofar as possible they serve them expeditiously.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true, of course. However, if the gentleman from Wisconsin desires to offer an amendment, I personally would not object; in fact, I would endorse it. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to offer the amendment. May I inquire if the bill is subject to amendment at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not at this moment. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1898, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by inserting in section 3 thereof immediately preceding the word "Provided" where the same first appears in said section the following: "Provided, That no deed shall be issued unless application therefor be made within five years from the last day of sale, and if no such application be made then the owner of any property sold as aforesaid, or any other person having an interest therein at the time of redemption, may redeem the property by paying to the collector of taxes for the legal holder of the certificate the amount for which it was sold at such sale, exclusive of surplus, plus interest thereon for the first 2 years after the date of such certificate of sale at the rate hereinabove provided, and for 3 years thereafter at the rate of 6 percent per annum; that when the said property is redeemed as aforesaid, the collector of taxes shall, within a reasonable time thereafter notify the owner of record of such tax sale certificate at his last known address, by registered mail, of the redemption of such certificate; that within 5 years from the time that payment has been made to the collector of taxes to redeem such tax sale certificate, the owner thereof may apply for, and, upon the surrender of the certificate, shall receive from the District of Columbia

the payment made as hereinbefore prescribed; that upon the failure of the owner of such tax sale certificate to apply within the period of 5 years, as hereinbefore prescribed, such money shall be forfeited to the District of Columbia, and be deposited by the collector of taxes in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the chairman of the committee that, while the amendment is in the process of preparation, we might proceed to the consideration of the next bill and then come back to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the bill will be laid aside for the moment.

There was no objection.

PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 1951 to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to make a brief statement explaining the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I should call attention to the fact that under the proposed bill we attempt to deal with three acts; we would amend section 3 of the present Parking Facilities Act so as to permit the District to establish off-street parking facilities on property that belongs to the District, but not acquired under the act, when such facilities will not impair the use of the property for the purpose for which the land was originally acquired.

The National Park and Planning Commission would approve any use of property for this purpose.

Section 2 would amend the Parking Act to authorize the Commissioners to delegate to the parking agency the operation of the parking facilities under the Municipal Center.

Section 3 would amend the present act so that moneys collected from the operation of the Municipal Center parking facilities would be used in a fund for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph lettered (b) of section 3 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The words 'such property' in this paragraph shall include, in addition to property acquired under this act, any other property, heretofore or hereafter acquired by the District, until needed for the purpose for which it was acquired, or if no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired, or upon which parking facilities may be established without impairing its use for the purpose for which it was acquired: *Provided*, That in each case the agency shall have made a determination that parking facilities thereon are necessary or expedient. Before

establishing any parking facilities upon the property not acquired under authority of this act, the Commissioners shall request the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for its recommendation and it shall be the duty of said Commission to report thereon within 30 days of such request."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Commissioners are also authorized to delegate to the agency any or all of the powers vested in said Commissioners by sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Municipal Center,' approved June 6, 1940."

Sec. 3. Section 7 of said District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting, after the figures and abbreviation "(52 Stat. 192)," the words "and the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Municipal Center,' approved June 6, 1940."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin has his amendment ready, and I ask unanimous consent now to return to H. R. 2119, to amend the act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 2, line 11, after the word "within", strike out the words "a reasonable time" and insert "5 days."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARRYING OF CONCEALED WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2866) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who together with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE] went into this matter very thoroughly, make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it came to the attention of the committee through the instrumentality of the Attorney General that many times when people were apprehended on a charge of carrying concealed weapons where the weapons were actually disclosed, it became very difficult to obtain convictions.

This bill is an amendment to take care of this difficulty that has developed because of that situation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. What effect will this bill have upon a person's carrying a shotgun or any kind of weapon that is not concealed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That matter was discussed in the committee. My inquiry concerning this language as it might apply to a person carrying a shotgun in a car in the District of Columbia indicated that it would have no application.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, my attention is directed to the fact that the Senate has passed a similar bill (S. 1151). In view of this fact I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 22, sec. 3204) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. No person shall within the District of Columbia carry either openly or concealed on or about his person, except in his dwelling house or place of business or on other land possessed by him, a pistol, without a license therefor issued as hereinafter provided, or any deadly or dangerous weapon capable of being so concealed."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed. A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 2866) were laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3313) to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes."

The specific purpose of this bill is to include any appliance moved over the highway on wheels or traction tread including streetcars, draft animals, and beasts of burden.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle

traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Any person operating a vehicle, who shall injure any person therewith, or who shall do substantial damage to property therewith and fail to stop and give assistance, together with his name, place of residence, including street and number, and the name and address of the owner of the vehicle so operated, to the person so injured, or to the owner of such property so damaged, or to the operator of such other vehicle, or to any bystander who shall request such information on behalf of the injured person, or, if such owner or operator is not present, then he shall report the information above required to a police station or to any police officer within the District immediately. In all cases of accidents resulting in injury to any person, the operator of the vehicle causing such injury shall also report the same to any police station or police officer within the District immediately.

"Any operator whose vehicle causes personal injury to an individual and who fails to conform to the above requirements shall, upon conviction of the first offense, be fined not more than \$500, or shall be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and upon the conviction of his second or subsequent offense, shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or shall be imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Any operator whose vehicle causes substantial damage to any other vehicle or property and fails to conform to the above requirements, shall, upon conviction of the first offense, be fined not more than \$100, or be imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both; and for the second or any subsequent offense, be fined not more than \$300, or be imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

"(b) No individual shall, while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor or narcotic drug, operate any vehicle in the District. Any individual violating any provision of this subdivision shall, upon conviction for the first offense, be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and upon conviction for the second or any subsequent offense be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Upon conviction of a violation of any provision of this paragraph involving the operator of a motor vehicle, the clerk of the court shall certify forthwith such conviction to the designated agent of the Commissioners, who shall thereupon revoke the operator's permit of such individual.

"(c) Any violation of any provision of law or regulation issued thereunder which is repealed or amended by this act, and any liability arising under such provisions or regulations may, if the violation occurred or the liability arose prior to such repeal or amendment, be prosecuted to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia went into this proposal which was sent to us by the District of Columbia Commissioners. It was believed that we should consider the matter of persons who, in the District of Columbia, flee from the scene of an accident or who drive cars under the influence of liquor, and just how far the application of the present law would affect those individuals, whether it would go to the operator of the car or to others.

We found that the operator of a street car could not, in the District of Columbia, be required to report an accident

or identify himself to the individual involved even though there be substantial damage or personal injury. Neither can he be tried under the old act for operating a vehicle while under the influence of liquor. The bill brought to the House today from this committee would bring within the purview of the traffic regulations those who operate types of vehicles other than motorcars or streetcars.

It would apply to bicycles and to other mechanical means of transportation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, that completes the business for the District Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address delivered by the Honorable Fred Vinson, on the question of subsidies, and other excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES ONLY WAY TO KEEP DOWN COST OF LIVING AND PREVENT INFLATION, A VOTE AGAINST SUBSIDIES UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES IS A VOTE FOR UNBRIDLED INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House a few days ago reported a bill known as a bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation which brings up a fundamental question of policy for this Congress to consider and decide. That fundamental question of policy is whether or not we shall recognize and under certain conditions and situations pay subsidies of any kind or nature whatsoever.

We did not have a bill before us when the hearings were conducted before the Banking and Currency Committee, but at the conclusion of the hearings the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama, presented a bill which was reported favorably by the committee. Practically all of the members were in favor of extending the Commodity Credit Corporation. Some voted for reporting the bill with reservations. That is, they did not want to be bound to vote for section 3 of the bill as presented.

The main question to be considered is section 3 which purports to be in opposition to subsidies as they have been paid. The argument was freely made in the committee that we should not under any circumstances pay any part of anyone's grocery bill. That is a very well-worded phrase, a very appealing phrase and on first blush everyone will say that is exactly right, we should not pay anyone's grocery bill. Expanding upon that phrase, which was a very good one for the destructive purposes for which it was framed and coined, a campaign was conducted in that committee to outlaw all subsidies.

I am perfectly willing to vote directly on the question of subsidies. It is a question, in my opinion, whether or not we shall have subsidies at all or whether or not we shall have some subsidies. On careful analysis of this bill as reported you will discover that our friends on the Republican side who voted unanimously against what they call subsidies have not voted against all subsidies. They have voted against some subsidies and it is to that part of the bill I want to address my remarks today.

This bill is H. R. 3477, and if you will notice section 3 of that bill it is the one proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] which had for its purpose excluding all subsidies. It says in there that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not, neither shall any other governmental agency which is owned directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency, pay any subsidy or take any loss on any commodity. There shall not be any support prices, there shall not be any subsidies paid, there shall not be any losses taken by these agencies in any way, shape, form, or fashion. Up until there, of course, you would say, "Well, now, that is a direct declaration against subsidies." But may I invite your attention to the last proviso in that section 3. It says:

Provided further, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in any transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds.

The entire section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof:

Provided, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.

Now, that is just marching up the hill and marching back down again. It says that we are against all subsidies and no losses to be paid, no support prices, but if it happens to be domestic vegetable oils, fats, and oil seed, it is perfectly all right for the Government, and the Congress is saying as a matter of policy, that subsidies should be paid in the case of vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state what would come under that phrase, "Vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds"?

Mr. PATMAN. They are something that I think should be subsidized, but they are entitled to no more consideration than anything else. It involves products produced in my district, such as cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans, and things like that if they are vegetable. The inconsistency, and what borders at least upon hypocrisy, is the fact that our so-called opponents of subsidies have said in there that they are against all subsidies, but if it is vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds it is all right to subsidize, that they are in favor of that principle, but they are not if it is lard, if it is butter, if it is Cheddar cheese, or different things like that. They say as a matter of principle we are against that; we feel like it is paying somebody's grocery bill, and we are not going to be for it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does it not illustrate the inconsistency of the position when we would pay a subsidy on, for instance, oleomargarine, yet object to paying a subsidy for the production of butter?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I am glad the gentleman brings that up. Our friends say they are willing to subsidize oleomargarine, that is perfectly all right, and they ask you to recommend it and endorse it and say that you are for it. The sum of \$60,000,000 was used last year for these different subsidies on vegetable fats and oils. As a matter of principle, if it is vegetable fats and oils, it is all right to subsidize, but if it is not vegetable, it is absolutely wrong because it would pay somebody's grocery bill.

Let us examine this question of subsidies, and I want to seriously insist that every Member of the House give this consideration without reference to politics, without reference to anything except whether or not it is in the interest of the country and the war effort. If you will do that I believe you will come to the conclusion it is not only justified but it is the only way that you can get adequate production and at the same time keep down the cost of living. It is the only way to do it. If you will remember the words of the Chief Executive, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he has told us time and again that if we have any other method to keep down the cost of living

and to keep down inflation as an alternative, to suggest it, it is all right with him. But here is Congress—which I brand as an inflationary Congress—this is an inflationary Congress. We have demonstrated that as a Congress we are inflationary, that we are willing for prices to get out of control, that we are willing for the dollars to become worth dimes. We are not concerned about that. We are not as a Congress concerned about inflation, and we have demonstrated it.

We are doing that in the face of the fact that we are told that if we have another remedy to present it will be all right with him, but we have no alternative, we have no remedy, we propose nothing, we are just against something.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman and indirectly to the President that the Representative of the Seventh District of Wisconsin has been trying to do that for the last month, but he just cannot get it done.

Mr. PATMAN. What is the gentleman's alternative?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We have tried at least to get this feed in here without having all this bucket-shop operation.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies for feed?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. We do not need a subsidy if we can get it in here.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies for feed? The gentleman is either for it or against it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am making the point that the majority leader has taken it upon himself to try to get this feed in here at a cheaper price, and that the powers that be do not seem to want it in here.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has brought up a very interesting point. The dairyman's price has been frozen in order to hold down the cost of living. If you increase the salaries and wages 10 percent it will be \$10,000,000,000 more, and that will add to the excess purchasing power already floating around. So the desire is to keep the cost of living down to this September 15, 1942, level. How are you going to do that and take care of the farmer and keep him in business and encourage him to produce unless you give him a subsidy? That is the only way on earth you can do it that I have found. If you will present any other way I will be for it, it makes no difference to me. But we cannot have that squeeze there on the dairyman. It either has to be taken care of by an increased price, which would cause a demand for increased wages and salaries, or you have to subsidize this extra cost of feed the gentleman has just mentioned. That is the only way I know of you can do it.

What is so sacred about the word "vegetable"? If you say a subsidy is so good and support prices so fair, that we can take losses on vegetable oils and fats,

why can you not conceive of other situations where it would be just as important? Are we not bordering on the ridiculous as well as the hypocritical when we put language like that in a bill which we say is intended to outlaw subsidies entirely?

Another reason is that the people who are for this provision are not against all subsidies. The people in New England have their transportation costs subsidized on fuel oil. That is as it should be. I would not change it if it were within my power to do it. I think it is all right, but it is a subsidy. So how can you say if you subsidize oils and fats that are not vegetable it is a subsidy and wrong, it is helping pay somebody's grocery bill, but on the other hand it is all right to help pay somebody's fuel bill, that is not wrong?

Then you take public housing, which we have all endorsed because we have to have public housing around these war plants, and we are subsidizing public housing, which is in effect helping pay the rent of the workers. We are letting them have these houses for a rental that is much less than it would cost normally. We are subsidizing it. So it is wrong to help pay anybody's grocery bill, if it is nonvegetable, it is wrong to help pay anything else, but it is all right to help pay your fuel bill, it is all right to help pay your rent bill; that is in the public interest and should be recognized and endorsed and sponsored and approved, and the Chief Executive has to carry it on.

It just does not make sense. Here we are as a Congress. There will be some doubt as to our intellectual honesty if we put such provisions as this in a bill stating that vegetables it is all right to subsidize and nonvegetables it is wrong, as a matter of principle, to subsidize; it is helping pay your grocery bill.

Take sugar. That is a case where a subsidy is absolutely justified. Nobody can contend otherwise. We produce only one-fifth of the sugar that is consumed in this country. Our sugar-beet and sugarcane growers cannot compete with imported sugar. Why should we increase the price of all sugar just to take care of one-fifth? There is only one way on earth to take care of that, and that is to give that one-fifth an extra price here in the United States. So, by putting 1 cent a pound on one-fifth of the sugar, we keep the price down at least 1 cent on the other four-fifths, all of it; is not that right? Does anyone say that is wrong? If you pass this bill, you stop that, because it is not vegetable, it is not vegetable oils or fats or oil seeds. You will stop the sugar subsidy.

Further, you take metals that are so vital for the defense of our country. Consider copper. When this war commenced we needed to increase the production of copper. The big copper companies were making plenty of money at 12 cents a pound; they were making more money than they knew what to do with. In order to increase the production of copper were we going to say,

"Well, we have to induce these high-cost mines to get into production. It will cost 17 cents or 25 cents or 30 cents to bring them in, but we must have the copper and we are willing to pay for it; we have to have it." We did not do that, we did not increase the price of all copper to get that production. We froze the price at 12 cents on that production, but we told the high-cost miner, "You go out and, if it takes 5 cents more or 30 cents more, you get that copper and we will pay for it, but we will do it as a subsidy." We increased the copper production 10 percent.

Would it not have been silly, absolutely, for us to have paid from 5 to 30 cents more a pound on that 90 percent in order to get that extra 10 percent? Does anybody say that subsidy is wrong? No; that is all right. It is good principle; we endorse it; it is fine.

There are lots of things like that. I will show my colleagues where we can save lots of money, and it is necessary that we keep down the cost of this war. We have kept it down by subsidizing the high-cost producer in order to get production. Why increase everybody in price up to the top man? Is that the way to stop inflation or hold down the cost of production? No. That is the way to guarantee it. That is what you do if you pass this bill as you have it here.

A STEP TOWARD UNBRIDLED INFLATION

This is a bill to promote inflation. This is a bill to have unbridled inflation, to increase the cost of living, and to stop production, because you are not going to get farmers to produce where dollars are not worth anything; and if you equalize the difference in the cost of living by raising wages and salaries, it will be just like putting a match under a thermometer—the mercury will go out the top. That is what will happen. This is the longest step toward inflation I have ever known to be made in the Congress of the United States. It is a step toward unbridled inflation.

I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a very interesting, informative, and timely address delivered by the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, before the Washington Board of Trade, on October 20, 1943, on the subject Weapons Against Inflation. It is in connection with the remarks I am making about subsidies and is as follows:

You businessmen, here and in the radio audience, do not need any lecture from me about the dangers of inflation. You believe, as I do, that the preservation of our free-enterprise system offers the best hope for a prosperous, growing, dynamic America in the period of healing and restoration which must come after the war drums have ceased to throb and the boys are back from the battlefields.

Inflation, I confidently assert, is the deadly enemy of private enterprise and of a free economy. Inflation always ends; and deflation always follows in its train. Deflation brings in its wake unemployment and hunger, bankruptcy and foreclosure. Labor, agriculture, and industry are equally its victims. The chaos and panic of deflation will

inevitably unloose forces which eat away the foundations of the economic and social order.

In Kentucky we say that nobody can beat the horses. As to that I will not testify. But I am sure that nobody can beat inflation.

Up until May I should have been willing to go further and say that nobody wants inflation. In May I took over my present office and now I'm not so sure.

Just a few weeks ago I was talking to the leader of one of our most effective pressure groups, who was rather critical of our "hold the line" policy. I questioned him and he told me quite frankly that he thought a mild dose of inflation might be helpful to the country, and especially helpful to those whom he represented.

Sometimes, however, I am pessimistic enough to believe that this gentleman was not alone. Perhaps there are others who, though not quite candid enough to admit it, feel that a mild dose of inflation would be good for what ails them.

Such people may be all too numerous. However numerous, they are not our chief danger. The real threat to stabilization comes from sincere, earnest Americans who sincerely and earnestly support stabilization—for the other fellow. It is all too easy for each individual to stabilize the other fellow's wages, freeze the other fellow's prices, and raise the other fellow's taxes.

Mine is the unpleasant job of reminding all these groups, "Uncle Sam included you." For it will do us little good and much harm to utter homilies against inflation in general, while we belie our professions with a series of petty concessions each day—acts of small appeasement, each unimportant in itself, but altogether spelling out inflation with the inevitability of a jigsaw puzzle.

If we will the end, then let us be brave enough to will the means. If you want us to stabilize, then we must have the tools to do the job.

Tonight I will discuss one of these tools which, in my judgment, we must have if we are to hold the line.

I come, then, right to the point and talk about subsidies.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives has reported out a bill which would prohibit the use of Federal funds by any Government agency to subsidize the production or distribution of food or to hold down prices to the housewife.

At the outset, I say to you solemnly that such a restriction would torpedo the stabilization policy as effectively as any U-boat ever torpedoed a Liberty ship.

Efforts have been made by some propagandists to give the word "subsidy" an evil smell. These specious pundits seek to create the impression that there is something un-American or sinister about subsidies. These reckless critics need an elementary course in American history. There is nothing new about subsidies—except the violence of the opposition to them.

Since the founding of this Republic, funds from the Federal Treasury—subsidies—have been used to achieve various objectives of national policy. The biggest subsidy of them all, the tariff, was enacted by our First Congress. Down through the years, this Nation has repeatedly used the resources of the Public Treasury to speed our national progress or to promote the general welfare.

The development of this great continent is due in no small part of the use of common resources—subsidies. Land grants to the railroads opened up the great West. The homestead laws allotted free land to the hardy pioneers who built an empire. These, too, were subsidies. As early as 1891 ocean-going mail was subsidized to the tune

of \$20,000,000. Agriculture, transportation, and industries of most kinds have all at some stage of their growth received help from the Federal Treasury. They have been subsidized. And, at this good hour, some of the very newspapers which howl the loudest against subsidies for bread and meat have never refused the privilege of second-class mail at less than cost.

Subsidies or Federal aid, call it what you will, are as much a part of the American tradition as flapjacks or corn pone. Those who would have you believe that an odious stigma attaches to the word fail to understand the democratic spirit which demands that we pool common resources to meet a common crisis.

No one objects to the use of public funds for a laboratory to devise new weapons to conquer the enemy, or to stamp out some dread disease at home. We do not feel outraged when we read how subsidies developed our Nation—how they are used today to obtain copper, aluminum, coal, and oil for the war effort. Why then such a clamor against the use of subsidies to produce food for war? Perhaps it is because the alternatives have not been made clear.

There is only one real alternative—higher food prices. What will this mean? Higher wages. If these are granted, other costs will rise which will breed new demands for food and wage increases. The familiar spiral will be set in motion and inflation will be upon us.

Thus food prices must be kept down if we are to avoid inflation. It does not require an economic wizard to understand these simple facts.

Back in 1876 that distinguished Kentucky editor, Henry Watterson, was talking about the financial bugaboos of his day. He was discussing the Resumptionist "who wants to take a back somersault into a gold basin," and the "90-day Resumptionist," and the "Resumptionist who thinks the Radical Resumption Act a swindle." According to Marse Henry, the three are met by Mr. Toombs' old Georgia friend who wanted "to stamp out as much money as folks could spend," and when asked how it was to be redeemed, replied, "That's just what I'm coming to; I'm agin redemption."

From that date, Mr. Watterson expressed a prejudice, as it were, against repudiation. I have a similar prejudice against inflation and a passion for stabilization.

Let us examine briefly the fundamentals of the anti-inflation program. Congress, in the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, directed that the cost of living be stabilized as near as practicable at the levels of September 15, 1942. Nevertheless, by May 15 of this year, the cost of living had risen 6.2 percent above the levels prescribed by Congress. This was a serious situation which had prompted the President to promulgate his famous hold-the-line order. No prices or wages were to be increased except under strictly limited conditions and the agencies charged with the responsibility for holding down the cost of living were directed to take immediate steps to bring it back as near the level of September 15, 1942, as possible.

Although, as I have said, the cost of living last May was 6.2 percent above the prescribed level, not all items in the family budget showed increases of this amount. Rent, for example, had not increased during the 8-month period. House furnishings had increased by only nine-tenths of 1 percent, and clothing by 1.6 percent. A remarkably good job had been and is now being done in those fields.

The trouble was with food. Four-fifths of the increase in the cost of living which took place between September of 1942 and May of 1943 was due to failure to control effectively the prices for food. These prices rose by almost 13 percent during the 8-month period.

This was the major problem faced by your Government in the early summer of 1943.

Food prices were 13 percent above the levels prescribed by Congress, which had directed the President to grant no more general wage increases on the grounds of higher living costs. This was a solemn pledge to American soldiers on the production line that living costs would be held down. It was also a covenant to the millions of white-collar workers, the clergymen, school teachers, firemen, the old-age pensioners, and—of vital concern—the dependents of our fighting men on foreign soil. The Government had obligated itself to protect these groups and all of us against rising living costs.

Acting upon the mandate from Congress and the orders of the Commander in Chief, prompt action was taken to regain the lost ground and redeem the pledge of the Congress that living costs would be held down. Here is where subsidies came into play. While it is possible to reduce some prices without subsidies, such action was not possible in the case of butter and meat. The prices received by the farmers and distributors did not permit of reductions without bringing their returns to tax unreasonably low levels. Accordingly, a subsidy is being paid by the Government to the processor to enable him to reduce the price of these products without loss to himself and without reducing the price paid to the farmer.

There were other specific programs undertaken in the early part of last summer to meet the crisis in the stabilization program. The O. P. A. undertook a major revision in its food price-control program. It established simple dollars-and-cents ceilings on most food items to replace the cumbersome regulations that had developed over a period of a year.

As a result of these and other measures, the rise in the cost of living was brought to an abrupt halt. For the first time since war began in Europe, the cost-of-living index began to decline. In June of this year, the index was 5.9 percent above the September level; in July a further decline to 5.1 percent above September 1942 was noted, and in August living costs dropped to 4.6 percent above the date set in the Stabilization Act of 1942.

Clearly, we had the high cost of living on the run. The upward trend had been arrested and some of the lost ground regained. And—mark this well—subsidies, as in the case of meat and butter, were responsible for a major portion of success of our victories on the stabilization front during the summer of 1943.

Now, just as success is within our grasp, we have pending before the House of Representatives a proposal which would knock our entire structure into a cocked hat. The Wolcott amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill would abruptly terminate at the end of this year all subsidies now in effect, with the notable exception of subsidies on peanuts and cottonseed and other domestic vegetable oils. Why these commodities were exempt from the prohibition is not explained on any rational ground. It is an obvious political concession by those who rest their case against subsidies on the high ground of principle.

There will be immediate consequences of a disastrous nature if this anti-subsidy bill becomes law. According to its terms, present programs for which funds are available must terminate not later than December 31, 1943.

Let me summarize for the housewife the immediate effect upon the new year's market basket:

Each loaf of bread will cost at least a penny more.

Each pound of butter will increase at least 5 cents.

Each quart of milk will advance at least 1 cent.

Each pound of bacon, cut of beef, pork chop, ham, and every ounce of hamburger or sausage will advance at least 10 percent.

Each can of vegetables will advance at least 25 percent.

Each pound of American cheese will advance at least 4 cents.

Each pound of sugar will go up 1 cent.

Each pound of potatoes will go up from 2 to 3 cents.

Prices will advance on prunes, raisins, onions, peanut butter, oranges, grapefruit, and other commodities upon which the agencies of Government have programs under way or contemplate transportation or other subsidies to obtain stable and uniform prices.

These will be the immediate results if Congress shackles the hands of the Executive in the battle against inflation. The cost of food, it is estimated, would immediately rise from 4 to 6 percent if the existing or immediately contemplated programs were terminated. But this is only the beginning.

Once the trend is on the upswing, other prices will be affected. No method has yet been discovered to isolate or quarantine a price increase. And the increases which this proposal would require would only be the spark which might start a sweeping fire of inflation.

The pending amendment would prohibit the War Food Administration from underwriting farm production for 1944. Never before in our history has there been such a need for maximum food production. Civilian demand is at the highest level and the requirements of our armed forces and our allies are tremendous. The American farmer has for the past 3 years or more achieved a miracle of production. In spite of the handicaps of manpower and some shortage of farm machinery, agricultural production has successively increased.

For 1944, the War Food Administration has planned even greater production. As an essential tool in achieving that production, American farmers have been given the assurance that their prices would be supported at levels which would remove the economic hazards in increasing production. Because of our desperate need for increased food supplies, the Government, in effect, extended to American agriculture an insurance policy. Farmers have been told that if they would increase production of crops and livestock, the Government would guarantee that their prices would not fall below a prescribed level.

This bill would prohibit the use of support prices because it would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from assuming any losses if the market fell below the prices guaranteed.

Therefore, as I view it, this measure would make the Government impotent to underwrite the production of necessary food. If enacted, it would constitute a serious blow to our war effort.

The War Food Administration reports that the ultimate cost to the Government of discontinuing these programs would be several times greater than the losses incurred under present programs. At the same time, many price ceilings would be more difficult to enforce because the Government would be powerless to absorb transportation and other costs necessary to establish uniformity in the general price structure. Instead of making our ceilings simpler, we should be forced to make them complicated and unenforceable.

Those who assert that we can let food prices go up and at the same time hold wages at their present levels are living in a dream world. The National War Labor Board has done a tremendously effective job in stabilizing wage rates. However, it is quite clear that the Board's effectiveness will depend in a large measure upon our ability to hold down food prices.

Recently, for instance, the Board was faced with a demand for higher wages by shipyard workers. These employees contended that the Government had failed to control living costs, and demanded that the Board abandon the "Little Steel" formula.

The Board denied this request. In doing so, its language was highly significant: "The sound conclusion," said the Board's opinion, "is not that the policy should be abandoned but that it should be held on to, while giving particular attention to better control of the cost of food. That is precisely the policy that has been followed by the Government."

On June 29, 1943, the Board spoke plainly: "This increasing cost of food gravely affects the wage-stabilization program of the National War Labor Board. The Board believes that its established wage stabilization policy is effective. It believes that policy should be carried forward in full cooperation with the other agencies of Government responsible for the other factors of the over-all economic stabilization program. But the Board states with all the emphasis at its command that its wage-stabilization program calls for a prompt carrying forward of announced policies of the administration affecting the cost of food. In the considered opinion of the Board, this is essential to the success of national economic stabilization."

"Subsidies are among the instruments which have proved effective to control food prices. The War Labor Board unanimously supports the administration's intention to use those and all appropriate measures in its food-price policy."

There is little need, in the face of this warning, to point the moral or adorn the tale. Wages and prices must ultimately go up or go down together. In 1941 and 1942 we tried to control prices without controlling wages. The experiment did not succeed. That was one reason why Congress passed the Stabilization Act in October 1942.

Let us not attempt an equally futile effort to try controlling wages in the face of skyrocketing food prices.

Rather let us irrevocably resolve to stabilize every factor in our national economy. Only from such a resolute policy can we draw the strength to fight successfully against the ravaging fevers of inflation.

The evil effects of antisubsidy legislation would not, however, be confined to labor and agriculture. Every group, organized and unorganized, would also suffer from the cancer of inflation. Not the least of these would be American business.

With all sincerity I assert that those who would, by forbidding subsidies, manacle their Government in this great home-front struggle are assuming an awful and solemn responsibility. Most of them, I readily admit, are acting from the purest and most disinterested motives. But there are others, I sometimes suspect, who would make this great economic issue the football of partisan and pressure-group politics. These few, like mischievous children, are playing with fire in an ammunition dump piled high with superexplosives.

The opponents of subsidies have but a single argument. Higher production costs must somehow be paid, and it is better that they be paid directly and openly by increasing prices. Subsidies, these critics claim, only hide the increased burden, which must ultimately be paid in taxes.

Such an argument, of course, begs the question. It assumes that we can let food prices go up and yet hold down wages. It is predicated upon a repudiation of the solemn covenant embodied in the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942. Such a repudiation is unthinkable; and those who advocate it are living in blissful ignorance of the economic and other pressures which exist in a war economy.

Subsidies, then, are actually less costly than higher prices, and not only to the economy but to the taxpayer as well. The Government is spending \$100,000,000,000 for war purposes. Higher prices not only cost consumers more; they cost the Government more. For instance, it is estimated that our present food subsidy program saves the Treas-

ury \$5 for every dollar paid out. Subsidies, by minimizing cost increases and by holding wages in line, save money for consumers and taxpayers alike.

To those who would play with fire we must throw out a challenge. I do not believe that any group in America will dare vote up the price of bread and meat, potatoes and milk, bacon and beans, butter and cheese, onions and oranges. It is hard to believe that any pressure group will dare assume responsibility for the devastating and disastrous consequences of such an act.

But this I do know. The executive department of your Government will fight to the last ditch to prevent the release of this inflationary cyclone.

I do not mean to tell you tonight that subsidies are the only weapon in our armory. We must continue to use with rigor and resolution the other weapons we already have—price control at all levels in the economic process, wage stabilization, and rationing. We must continue and increase our individual purchases of War bonds. We must pay off our debts. We must limit our purchases to those items which are absolutely essential.

We also need a further weapon—additional taxes. In framing a tax bill at present we must recognize its part in our battle against inflation and in our fundamental policy of distributing available food, clothing, and other goods on an equitable fashion. But this system is seriously threatened by the relentless pressure of too many loose and eager dollars. These dangerous dollars capture at illegal prices and without rationing points many of our civilian supplies. Supplies which are scarcely enough to go around. Then with prices of goods higher there is the clamor for wage increases, which, if granted, sets us off to the races.

Some for reasons incomprehensible or political doubt that we actually have more money to spend than there are goods and services to buy. I can tell you, however, that there is at present, on the basis of the current fiscal year, a minimum difference between spending money and available goods and services of at least sixteen to twenty billion dollars over and above all taxes, insurance premiums, savings accounts, debt repayments, and War bond purchases. This is entirely apart from the one hundred billions in demand and time deposits—accumulated and volatile purchasing power.

A large portion of these eager, restless dollars must be immobilized, siphoned off. That is why the administration has requested additional taxes yielding some ten and one-half billions more of revenue. A real tax program is vital to the stabilization program and also means that an additional portion of the war cost will be paid when we are most able to bear it. To increase taxes will, of course, mean some hardship. Only through taxes based on ability to pay can these hardships be held to a minimum. The administration program recognizes the problems of those whose lot is most difficult, and especially those whose incomes have not felt the impact of war prosperity. May I point out that the sacrifice of the taxpayer on the home front is not comparable to the sacrifice of the soldier on the war front? Take the case of the person earning two, three, or four thousand dollars a year who is taken into the armed forces. Not only does he brave the danger of disease and bullets, risking the loss of health, limb, or life, but he yields his civilian salary or wage for \$50 per month, Army rations, and sometimes fox holes for shelter. Those who never return will lose the priceless privilege of complaining about high taxes.

Those of us on the home front who are still receiving civilian salaries and wages—in many instances increased salaries and wages—who are enjoying the American way of life, certainly should be willing to pay more taxes in order that our economy might be on an

even keel when our absent ones return; pay more taxes in order that the fires of inflation will not consume our Government's allotment to the soldier's wife and children. In my opinion, our folks do not want luxurious baubles and second helpings of desert while reading of Bataans, Dieppes, and Salerno which lie ahead.

So I repeat that no one weapon can win the war, either on the battle front or the home front. Just as we must coordinate land power, sea power, and air power, so must we coordinate all our home-front weapons for a single objective—victory, a speedy victory.

And in the last analysis no weapon of warfare is victorious without the fighting spirit of the common soldier. So on the home front our fight against inflation cannot succeed without the fighting spirit of the people.

Without your help we are licked. And if we are licked, you are licked. But if we all pitch in and win this fight against inflation, then the America of today and of the boundless, challenging future will win an enduring and glorious victory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

LABOR SHORTAGE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the subject of manpower problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial of the Dallas News should be read by everyone and especially by the Members of the present Congress, as well as Government officials who are interested in our manpower problems:

GALLUP ON LABOR SHORTAGE

The most revealing poll conducted by Gallup in recent months was that printed in the News Saturday showing that less than half of the people of the Nation believe there is a labor shortage. "Hence, the Government's headache," says Dr. Gallup.

An interesting and hardly less revealing part of the report is Dr. Gallup's own comment: "War Manpower officials apparently have failed to dramatize the labor shortage in such a way as to convince the public that the problem is acute." Reading this, one wonders if it is the position of Dr. Gallup that, though his poll accurately reflects what people think, it does not reflect the actual truth because the Government has not properly "dramatized" the situation for their education. Dr. Gallup does not exactly state this, but he leaves this impression with the reader. After all, Dr. Gallup's headquarters at Princeton are pretty close to the atmosphere of Washington.

Fact is, the people that were interrogated by Dr. Gallup's census takers told the simple truth from simple observation. There is no need of dramatizing facts to get the American people to understand them, certainly not in instances where the evidence is in open daylight and as broad as the land. If Dr. Gallup will look at cold data, he will find that the labor force in this country is working a little above the 40-hour week as a whole, while the labor forces of Great Britain, Russia, Germany, and other Allied and enemy countries are working 50 to 70 hours weekly.

If Congress would amend the present wage-and-hour law to eliminate the extra half-time bonus on the workweek up to 48 hours, so that there could be an increase in production with only proportional increases in wages, the labor situation would very largely be relieved.

Mr. Speaker, on the 3d day of March of this year, I introduced in this House H. R. 2071. Section (a) of this bill is, as follows:

(a) No employee of the United States or of any employer other than the United States shall be paid for any employment in excess of any number of hours under 48 in any workweek at a rate greater than the regular rate at which such employee is employed; but this paragraph shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Section C of this bill is as follows:

(c) All provisions of law are suspended which (1) limit the number of hours that any such employee may be employed during any workweek, or (2) require any contract or agreement to include any provision or stipulation limiting the number of hours that any such employee may be employed during any specified period of time.

This bill should be enacted immediately and without hesitation. It would standardize 48 hours as a workweek, and in so doing it would increase manpower one-seventh. This increase would be of material aid in solving our manpower shortage. With this one-seventh added to the manpower of the Nation, it would also help to prevent the breaking up of the homes of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, in that it would eliminate part of the necessity for drafting these pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

It has been said against this bill that many workers are already working in excess of the 40 hours per week now provided by law. My answer to that is that a very small percent of the total workers are working in excess of 40 hours per week, and those who are working in excess of 40 hours per week are paid, under the law, time and one-half of the base pay for such excess work.

This extra pay, in most instances, is now being paid by the Government. It comes from the funds, or money, raised by taxation, and it is creating an extra burden on the taxpayers, who are now being strained to the limit in the raising of funds to carry on our war effort, and who will necessarily have to suffer more as tax burdens grow. This extra expense of overtime pay is, in itself, aiding inflation, which we are supposed to be fighting to hold down.

If the workers could see the agony the Ways and Means Committee of the House are going through, as they are now laboring to devise a new tax bill to raise additional revenue which is necessary to carry on our war effort, these workers would immediately see the necessity of H. R. 2071. And in further answer to the statement that many workers are working in excess of 40 hours per week, there are many companies and contractors who refuse to work their employees over 40 hours per week by reason of the added expense of the time and one-half pay for such excess work. On the other hand, they are creating, in some instances, three shifts a day rather than two, in order that they will not have to pay the extra expense of time and a half for overtime pay; and if H. R. 2071 was enacted into law, it would eliminate some of these extra shifts, thereby further relieving our manpower shortage.

Under H. R. 2071, the worker would work 8 hours a day. In doing this he would be working one-seventh more than he works under the 40-hour-week law. Likewise, he would be receiving one-seventh more pay for his daily or weekly wages. Is this a sacrifice too great for the American worker, when America is fighting for her very existence; when America's debt is largely in excess of the combined debts of Russia, England, and France? When the American worker is drawing from one-third to twice the amount of any other worker in the world today? Do you not believe he is willing to make this small sacrifice, to help win this war and preserve our democratic way of life?

I am informed that Russia has no law limiting work hours to any specified time. I am also informed that the British workweek before Dunquerque was from 52 hours to 56 hours, but that after Dunquerque it jumped to 72 hours, while the American workweek, by law, remains at 40 hours unless extra pay is given.

The millions of our American soldiers who are fighting on every battle front are not limited to 40 hours per week. Those men in the foxholes, the swamps, the jungles, and the deserts are on the job 24 hours per day.

The American people cannot and will not get alarmed at our Government's cry of shortage of manpower as long as the 40-hour-week law remains on the statute books. They cannot hear the cry of "wolf" when the War Department, the Navy Department, the Labor Department, the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission all file opposition to establishing a standard 48-hour-week law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a letter received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special permission heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] for 25 minutes.

SUBSIDIZED COMPETITION AND THE RURAL BANKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, slow death faces the small rural banks from Government-subsidized competition.

In these days of a high mortality rate in the ranks of small business the closing of a small rural bank goes unnoticed beyond a local news item, with perhaps a notice inserted in the local newspaper and paid for from the bank's own depleted assets. The effect on our national economy is infinitesimal, but it is a disaster of considerable local importance. Multiply this by the thousands of small rural banks in the country and you have

a picture of the dire national catastrophe that threatens.

I refer in general to competition from 19 lending agencies operating under the Department of Agriculture, and in particular to the activities of Production Credit Associations of the Production Credit Corporations under the Farm Credit Administration in the Department of Agriculture. In deference to the administration's fondness for alphabetical epitome I list the 19 agencies alphabetically. They are:

Central Bank for Cooperatives.
Commodity Credit Corporation.
Disaster Loan Corporation.
Electric Home and Farm Authority.
Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Security.
Farm Credit Administration.
Farm Security Administration.
Federal Credit Unions.
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
Federal Land Banks.
Land Bank Commissioner Loans.
National Farm Loan Association.
Production Credit Associations.
Production Credit Corporations.
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Rural Electrification Administration.
Not all of these agencies were created by acts of Congress, but by Executive orders and directives. Some, created by Congress as independent agencies, have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture by Executive order under President Roosevelt's reorganization plan of 1939. The result is that functions are controlled by appointive officials who are responsible to Congress only so far as the agency is dependent upon Congress for appropriations.

Charges of growing socialistic tendencies in the Department of Agriculture have stirred the interest of Congress. Committees have investigated the activities of certain agencies, and we recall the debate last spring on the agricultural appropriation bill in which the Farm Security Administration figured outstandingly. The Commodity Credit Corporation once narrowly escaped liquidation, and its existence is currently a matter of legislative consideration.

Mr. Speaker, many depression-created agencies of Government have long since served their purpose and, in the interest of a need for economy manifoldly enhanced by the terrific cost of a global war, should be liquidated. Some of the 19 agencies I have listed could well come within that category. And, although Congress has, through power on the purse strings, already curtailed activities of some of these agencies, the power must be exercised still more. Created for the commendable purpose of aiding through critical periods the financing of agricultural activities, the agencies have, I will agree, served a good purpose. We cannot say that future conditions will not again develop a need for them. But, what is to prevent their

Being rendered dormant in the interest of economy until their functions may again be required? The answer is, only the selfish desire of bureaucrats to keep the agencies alive regardless of conditions, and the political advantage to be derived therefrom.

These agencies were created to supplement the small rural banks which have always played an important part in financing agricultural activities—not for the purpose of destroying private enterprise. The small banks and rural communities were grateful for the Government's assistance. But now, like Little Red Riding Hood, they find the solicitude of a kindly grandmother replaced by the greed of a ravenous wolf. The rural banks find themselves in a death struggle of competition with lending agencies subsidized by Government funds—faced with increasing competitive activities subsidized by taxpayers' money, including that of the banks and their patrons.

I cite the example of one county in my congressional district to show the growth of Government competition with local banks. In this particular county from January 2, 1943, through March 16, 1943, agencies of the Department of Agriculture made 70.40 percent of the total dollar value of rural chattel loans, as compared with only 26.47 percent made by five local banks. Of this total 66.51 percent represented loans made by a production credit association. Without question the same percentage prevails wherever production-credit associations operate. It is true throughout Indiana.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What type of collateral was given by those people who borrowed on that 66 percent? Was it collateral that commercial banks could have accepted?

Mr. SPRINGER. Some of the collateral offered by those prospective borrowers was practically nil. It would not have been accepted in any instance by any of the local banks, because there was no worth-while security presented. In other instances the collateral offered was entirely adequate and was such that any bank, engaged in a conservative banking business, would have accepted.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman approach the comparative interest rates somewhere in his discussion?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall refer to that later in the discussion, provided I have the time to do so.

Mr. Speaker, such competition is unfair to the banks, and to the taxpayers. Local banks must depend upon their own resources and profits to expand and protect their volume of business. They are faced at present with shortage of manpower, and increasing burdens heaped upon them by Government restrictions and regulations—to say nothing of the cooperation they are expected to give in War bond drives, rationing, and other

war activities. Any advertising or solicitation of business that they carry on to survive must be paid for by the banks themselves, yet Government lending agencies have available unlimited propaganda material, including press handouts forced upon local newspapers. Rural banks cannot long survive this competition, and I am sure no one will deny the disaster that will follow if the backbone of our national economy—the small rural banks—should be put out of existence.

I will not take the time of the House to discuss each of these lending agencies—their values can best be left to the consideration of appropriate committees at the proper time. However, I do wish to bring to attention the activities of one in particular. I refer to the production credit system which includes one production credit corporation in each of the 12 farm credit districts, and 529 production credit associations.

Under the Farm Credit Act of 1933 there was created a revolving fund of \$120,000,000 upon which the system was established. This fund was made up from certain unobligated balances of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, \$40,000,000 from money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and \$2,000,000 appropriated for administrative expenses in the establishment and supervision of the production credit corporations and production credit associations. As of December 31, 1942, total capitalization of the 529 production credit associations was \$104,248,697. Of that amount \$81,214,125 was class A stock owned by production credit corporations, \$1,042,127 was class A stock owned by farmer members, and \$21,992,445 was class B stock owned by farmer members. In other words, nearly 80 percent of the total capitalization is owned and controlled by a Government agency. Therefore, competition with local banks is 80 percent Government responsibility.

I feel that in passing legislation to establish this means of financing aid to agricultural production Congress was motivated by the sole desire to aid and supplement local financing institutions founded by resourceful citizens of thriving communities. I am certain that it was not the will of the people, nor the intention of Congress, that it should operate to destroy the very thing it was to supplement. But that will come to pass unless the unwarranted activities of production credit associations are curtailed.

Reports of active solicitation of loans by production credit associations persist despite denial by Government officials. In denial officials say that this sort of activity is hardly possible under gasoline rationing. But O. P. A. regulations have provisions under which individuals engaged in such solicitation might be considered eligible for supplemental gasoline—especially in view of the claims Government lending agencies are making for their continued existence. These agencies are not bashful about inventing essentiality to the war effort and even the post-war period.

The activities of production credit associations are really masterful innovations. They have, for instance, established victory clubs, such as victory pig clubs or victory calf clubs. The idea is that when a farmer is granted a loan for production purposes he pledges one hog, or one calf, to War bonds. I hardly believe that Government regulations permit local banks to place special stipulations in a loan.

I have in my possession evidence of the latest innovation of production credit associations in local bank competition. It is a form letter addressed to farmer-members. I will read it:

We have four things to write about, three of which concern you, the fourth concerns this association.

1. If you are in a position to do so, it is your patriotic duty to support the third big War bond drive which is being conducted this month.

This letter is dated September 4, 1943.

2. We are not urging you to borrow money to buy War bonds, but if you care to do so, we can make short-term loans or advances for reasonable amounts for bond purchases. If you do not have an active loan, we can set up a loan for War bond purchases at our regular 4½ percent interest rate and no other charges.

3. If you now have a loan, we can approve releases of livestock sales for War bond purchases for reasonable amounts in keeping with your financial position.

4. Although we get no compensation of any kind for handling bonds, we are anxious to issue as many bonds as possible.

That is an interesting statement, in view of the offer to make loans for War bond purchases. The letter concludes—

Many people forget that we have bonds to sell in all of our offices. When you are solicited for bond purchases, see that your bonds are to be issued by your production credit office. Our offices are supplied with series E bonds.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of competition that rural banks are objecting to in their struggle for existence. It is evidence of the unembarrassed activities by which emergency-created agencies seek to prolong their activities, and strengthen their position at the cost of private enterprise. It is an example of how these agencies seize upon the war emergency in an effort to justify their continued operations founded on taxpayers' money. Are they blind to the knowledge that such tactics will destroy the very thing that made them possible? Or, is it an unwitting collaboration in a general plan to destroy our national economy, and substitute an economy of the State?

Dr. C. W. Warburton, Deputy Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, has denied many of the reports of active loan solicitation by production credit associations. I intend to ask him for an explanation of this documentary evidence I have just submitted. I am interested in knowing just how such activities can be considered as a direct contribution to agricultural production by providing credit for farm and ranch operations. In my opinion the letter of the law is being seriously stretched, if not broken.

Many of these lending agencies are so constituted as to be almost beyond the

reach of Congress. But Congress has a responsibility to face, and must employ some method to control such activities that will destroy the rural banks of the Nation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I will gladly yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Permit me to make this very brief statement. I think the subject on which the gentleman has just talked is one of the most serious that we have in the country, and I am entirely sympathetic with his position. What was the attitude of the banks in the gentleman's area toward foreclosures during that period, we will say, the peak of the period, between 1929 and 1934? Were the banks in the gentleman's area foreclosing on the farmers in that area, and were the banks lending to farmers during that period? I recall that one of the lending institutions to which the gentleman has referred, and I think more than one, actually came into existence because of the unwillingness of the banks to enter that field.

Mr. SPRINGER. During that period to which the gentleman refers our banks were making loans, and they were making loans where there was adequate or even partially adequate security for the loans. May I observe that there were, in some instances, foreclosures, but during that period of time we were suffering a terrible hardship in our agricultural sections. That period has largely passed and now the banks have ample funds on hand to loan, and they are ready and willing to make loans but they are met with this unfair competition to which I have referred. In this unfair competition we find men going about personally soliciting loans, and we have instances such as that to which I have referred, where they circularize the people of entire communities, and in entire districts, in which they are advertising for loans at a reduced rate of interest, which is the most unfair competition imaginable against our rural banks. After all, those rural banks, and our local loan agencies, are the backbone of every community in this entire Nation. They have contributed largely to the building and development of every community in our several States.

I think that the gentleman has raised a good question and I am happy to advise him that in my district the banks are ready and willing to make loans. They want to go forward, they want to continue their business on a sound basis, but, as I have stated, in that particular area in which these production credit associations have been operating, over 70 percent of the chattel loans have been made by those Government lending agencies. Our banks and lending agencies, in the local communities, are entitled to some protection at the hands of their Government, instead of the unfair competition which the Government now offers. Our Government should not destroy private enterprise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. THOMASON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is indeed unfortunate, in view of the wishes of a vast majority of the people in this country who have spoken so decisively on the subject, that the executive branch of the Government should continue in its attempt to force upon the country its program of consumer subsidies and price roll-backs.

Major representative farm organizations, I think with only one exception, vigorously oppose such a program. Individual farmers almost without exception everywhere, oppose such a program. Livestock producers of cattle, sheep, and hogs, oppose such a program. Feeders and processors of livestock products almost without exception oppose such a program. A vast majority of the people's representatives in the Congress have consistently and persistently opposed such a program.

Notwithstanding all of this, and the overwhelming sentiment expressed by both Houses of the Congress just previous to the adjournment, an attempt is again being made to saddle this un-American program upon the country.

It is difficult for the people in my section of the United States to understand the motivating influence behind this proposal. If they believed such a program was a barrier against, or even an aid toward, controlling inflation, they would probably be willing to go along with such a scheme; but no one so far has been able to successfully explain why the dumping of millions and perhaps billions of dollars, that would be required to finance such a program out of the Public Treasury, into an already disrupted economy, would do anything other than add to the burden of inflation.

They cannot understand the logic or common sense of those who say that the Government should step in and pay a part of the food bill of an industrial worker who is receiving \$10, \$15, or \$20 per day, or to the large salary groups, or to the industrialists who are making the greatest profits of all time.

When you relieve these millions of a part of their food bill, by paying it back to them through Government subsidies, you leave in their hands (to be expended if they can) the excess to spend for unrationed articles of food as well as luxuries and a dozen or more other things not affected by price control.

I was very much interested recently in checking through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 14, at the extension of remarks inserted therein by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] an able member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in which he suggests that this question of consumer subsidies is a partisan political issue. To quote briefly from his remarks:

This brings up the question of subsidies as an issue between the two major parties, Democrats and Republicans. This is un-

fortunate. The Republicans on the committee—11—voted solidly against subsidies, and they were joined by the Progressive on the committee, the Honorable MERLIN HULL, and four Democrats. The Democrats on the committee voted 10 to 4 in favor of supporting the President's anti-inflation program to keep down the high cost of living.

As far as I am personally concerned, I would be perfectly willing to make the subsidy program a political issue. The facts, however, as disclosed by the record during the time that this whole matter of consumer-subsidies has been considered by the Congress, in my humble judgment in no way warrants the charge made by our distinguished friend from Texas.

In June this year, when the House had under consideration H. R. 2369, which was a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered an amendment to the bill in the form of a new section which provided, among other things, the prevention of the use of Government funds to pay consumer subsidies.

The amendment was agreed to in the committee without a record vote. When the bill was reported back to the House a separate vote was demanded on the Wolcott amendment by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. And while a record vote was not taken, the following colloquy occurred, as will be disclosed at page 6548 of the RECORD for June 25, 1943:

Mr. DINGELL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it. Mr. DINGELL. Is this the amendment that has to do with the elimination of the payment of any subsidies?

The SPEAKER. This is the Wolcott amendment as amended.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to have an explanation of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not presumed to know the language of the amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT and Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Does this record bear out the statement of my distinguished friend that the question of consumer subsidies is political? His party has a majority in the House. If it is only the Republicans that are opposing consumer subsidies, why could not he muster enough votes in his

own party to obtain a record vote. Let us further examine the charge of the distinguished gentleman, that the payment of subsidies is partisan political issue. It will be recalled that when the commodity credit bill, including the Wolcott amendment, was passed by both Houses of the Congress and sent to the President, it came back to the Congress vetoed, with rather sharp words from the Chief Executive on the question of consumer subsidies. He gave the membership a pretty severe lacing down for refusing to permit consumer subsidies, and when the bill came back upon a reconsideration of the passage of the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, on a roll-call vote, 228 Members of the House voted to override the veto, and only 154 Members voted to sustain, while a few votes were lacking sufficient to override the veto, a substantial majority did vote in the affirmative. Again may I remind the gentleman that his party is in the majority, and if it is a partisan political issue, how does the gentleman explain the fact that a very substantial majority of the membership voted to override instead of sustain the President's veto? I have not broken down or made a political analysis of the 228 Members who voted to override the veto, but since the gentleman has charged that those who oppose subsidies are Republican partisans, I was interested in checking his own State delegation for the purpose of ascertaining how they voted, all of whom are Democrats, and whose genuine party loyalty I am sure cannot be challenged by anyone. It is interesting to note that included in this distinguished list of Texas Democrats who voted to override the President's veto, and thus register their protest against consumer subsidies, such distinguished names appear as LUTHER A. JOHNSON, PAUL KILDAY, RICHARD KLEBERG, FRITZ LANHAM, BOB POAGE, JUDGE SUMNERS, MILTON WEST, and we might go on. In almost every solid South State, where only Democrats are sent to Congress, there will be found the names of distinguished Members of this House registering their votes against consumer subsidies.

Now, let us take my own State and take a look at the record. Mr. BOREN, Mr. DISNEY, and Mr. STEWART joined with me in their votes to override the President's veto and thus register their protest against the payment of consumer subsidies. Does my friend from Texas question their democracy or loyalty to their party? Bringing the matter down to date, according to the gentleman's own statement, when this matter was before the Banking and Currency Committee last week 11 Republicans, 4 Democrats, and 1 Progressive voted to kill consumer subsidies. It was this action on the part of the committee which caused him to charge that it was a partisan political matter. The vote in the committee according to his statement on the question of consumer subsidies, was 16 against to 10 for, I do not know, and am not interested, except to congratulate them, as to

who the 4 Democratic members of his party were, who voted against consumer subsidies, suffice it to say that almost a third of the members on that committee belonging to the gentleman's party registered their disapproval of this un-American program.

No, Mr. Speaker; it is not a question of party politics, rather I believe it to be one of fundamental government philosophy. Each succeeding day reminds us more and more of the fact that the world is now, and has been for some time, involved in sweeping economic, social, and political changes, unleashed perhaps by the First World War, which together with tremendous advances through science and invention, brought about an apparent failure of our economic system to advance and keep pace with the welfare of the people. The difficulties have perhaps been augmented by the present all-out global war and we are confronted with tremendous and complicated economic problems. In the solution of these problems we are face to face with two clashing philosophies of government. One of these philosophies proposes the solution of these problems through a vast further turn toward complete centralization of authority in the Federal Government. Economic planning with strong coercion of individuals by and through Executive directives operating through a network of bureaus. The other philosophy, and the one to which I subscribe, proposes to accomplish the same end within the framework of a strong local, as well as Federal Government, and the development of understanding and voluntary cooperation among freemen. One of these philosophies insists on changes of what has always been considered fundamentals, and advocates abandoning or suspending the charter of government so to speak, while the other advocates a program in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution. One of these philosophies is represented by the New Deal. The other is simply traditional American principles. This new philosophy failed in its solution of our economic problems in time of peace. It saddled an unprecedented debt upon our country while the problems remained unsolved. Day by day now its failure to solve our increased economic problems brought on by the war, is more apparent. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this new philosophy for the solving of our economic ills was sure to fail, either in peace or at war because a republican form of government, a representative democracy so to speak, cannot exist under that sort of philosophy. I believe that all of the problems now confronting us can be solved, and that their solution can be brought about through the traditional American system, in the American way, in the spirit of the Constitution, and by and through the three separate and distinct branches of our government. This payment of consumer subsidies is fundamentally unsound, dishonest, and immoral, and I believe it will stimulate, rather than retard, inflation.

One of the leading newspapers in my State sums up this whole roll-back business editorially as follows:

The entire objective of the administration in attempting to impose consumer subsidies, disguised as farmer subsidies, has been and is to appease and favor the organized consumer vote in the East, while trying to make the farmer think he is being given something by the White House, and to make the public in general believe that if it were not necessary thus to subsidize the farmer, living costs would be very low indeed and the impacts of the war scarcely felt by anyone.

It is fourth-term hokum, of course, and the farmers have seen through it. In overwhelming majority, they oppose subsidies, since they are, in this case and among other reasons, designed to keep a measure of control over them, and to employ added bureaucratic fourth-term tub thumpers at public expense. Labor, momentarily, at least, was seemingly inclined to swallow the administration roll-back, subsidy, baloney in large chunks. But now comes an editorial in the influential workers' weekly, Labor, which under the heading "Roll-back looks like 'Gold brick'" has this to say about the subtle scheme, the consumers' subsidy masquerading as a farmers' subsidy and supposed to materially lower the cost of living.

"Workers who may have taken at face value an O. P. A. promise to roll back the cost of living by 2.3 percent are going to be sadly disappointed.

"Chester Bowles, O. P. A. general manager, said the cut-back would be achieved by reducing prices on apples, onions, potatoes, oranges, lard, shortening, and peanut butter.

"Labor research men analyzed his figures and the result was an eye opener. Boris Shishkin, A. F. of L. economist, concluded the announced reductions wouldn't roll back living costs more than 1 percent.

"Another economist made the jibe that the O. P. A. program 'rolls back the cost-of-living index faster than it rolls back the cost of living.'

"Even the New York Times branded the O. P. A. claim as a fake. It estimated benefits of the proclaimed program at even less than the laborites did—about one-half of 1 percent.

"Bowles was asked about these discrepancies and explained he relied on figures worked out by Richard V. Gilbert, his research adviser. Gilbert in turn gave out a complicated set of figures which he contended added up to the 2.3-percent reduction.

"We're from Missouri and we'll have to be shown," Shishkin countered. "Our calculations show the O. P. A. promise can't possibly be borne out by the facts unless that agency has something up its sleeve we're not being told about."

Hence it appears the subsidy scheme, costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, will benefit nobody—producer or consumer—and the only gain is the gain in the votes the administration hopes will result from its efforts to fool both the farmers and the consumers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know the gentleman is so fair he will want the Record to show that debate was cut off without the side sponsoring an amendment to the Wolcott amendment being given one word of discussion on the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. RIZLEY. Well, everyone is familiar with the Wolcott amendment. Everyone knew what it was when it was

considered on the floor. Everyone knew it had to do with consumer subsidies. They knew it when it came back with the President's veto, because he spent a great deal of time going into that subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICAN FASCISM

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in a message to the Congress dated September 17, 1943, the President said:

We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

Every American worthy of the name will applaud this objective. Before becoming too enthusiastic, however, let us analyze this term "fascism," in connection with the President's broad denunciation, in order that we may better understand his statement.

The term had its origin in a type of government instituted in Italy. It conceived the individual to be the servant and ultimately the slave of the state. It contemplated subjecting every citizen to the will and decrees of the state in return for alleged benefits passed from the state to the individual. It idealized the thought that the individual could purchase something called social security in exchange for his liberty and freedom.

Some of our intellectual liberals in this country have defined fascism as "the type of government in which a small group controls the military, governmental, economic, and cultural life of the people." In other words, pure fascism means a centralization of power in the hands of one man or a small group who by their directives and decrees control and rule the lives, liberty, and fortunes of the people. It is a philosophy based upon the theory that the individual is subservient to the state, and as such, is willing to exchange his liberty and freedom for a promise of so-called social security. It may be brought about by the quick break of revolution or may be ultimately accomplished by an insidious gradualist policy operating through alleged democratic process. It may be tyrannical or benevolent, but in either case it involves surrender of human liberty and freedom in exchange for regimented existence under unlimited state control and direction.

In the light, therefore, of these accepted definitions of the term "fascism" and in view of the President's expressed determination to crush it anywhere in the world, is it not proper that we critically examine our own economy in order to determine whether fascism in any of its malignant forms is entrenching itself in the vitals of our own system of government?

I am fearful that a new political gangsterism has been developed in this country which seeks to include as Fascists all individuals or organizations who dare

to express dissent from the existing New Deal order. Today the word "Fascist" is being bandied about by many self-styled liberals in order to cloak and cover their own political bigotry. It will be recalled that only a few years ago the word "Red" or "Bolshevik" was used in much the same way. Certain new political gangsters who seek to import foreign ideologies into our American system have developed what they think is a very clever technique. Their efforts may be observed in the incessant meetings that go on through the country under the pretense of helping China, extolling Russia, demanding a second front in the west, and so forth. Lately, these political racketeers have dropped all pretense and are demanding the suppression of this or that group of Americans because it is claimed that they are Fascists or that their principles are motivated by Fascist tendencies. This group is constantly engaged in well-organized and well-financed political intimidation.

I have no quarrel with those who seek to wipe out fascism as the term is well understood. I do want to call attention to the fact, however, that many of the same Fascist tendencies which we seek to destroy on foreign soil are finding their way into our own economy under a guise designated as liberalism. These new political self-styled liberals are constantly directing the attention of the American people to the terrorism of Fascist government abroad. They cleverly omit any disparagement of the Communist type of fascism. They always have an escape argument in their contention that while communism is Fascist in character, it is benevolent in purpose and hence should be applauded rather than condemned. They admit the Fascist character of many New Deal practices, but again side-step condemnation by the specious argument that such policies and practices have grown up under democratic process. They gloss over the development of true Fascist tendencies in our own domestic economy. The constant grasp for power of a well-entrenched small group in this country is a pure Fascist threat that should merit the condemnation of every thoughtful American. The constant growth of federalized bureaucracy, coupled with the incessant demand for greater and further Federal control—the constant destruction of State sovereignty practiced by entrenched bureaucracy and the constant grasp for power by the inner clique of the New Deal represent, in my judgment, the most direct Fascist threats that face our Nation today.

The strange fact is, however, that many of those who denounce fascism abroad are loud in their praises of entrenched bureaucracy here at home. Is it small wonder, therefore, that courageous men and women in these United States of America, without regard to party labels, are becoming sincerely alarmed over this typical Fascist threat? Is it not high time that those who are denouncing fascism in its broadest definition as applied to foreign states, should now be called upon to denounce with

equal fervor the Fascist threat to our own economy which has steadily developed to a point where we are largely ruled by the decrees of mere men rather than by rules of law adopted by the people's representatives?

Is it not time that the actions of the Executive be critically examined in view of the pure Fascist character of many of his domestic actions? Are not his constant, and many times successful, attempts to override the express will of the people, as reflected in congressional action, typical Fascist tendencies? A few examples will suffice—Congress clearly expressed its will against the \$25,000 salary limitation. The President, by Executive order, defied the congressional will. Congress definitely refused to appropriate money with which to build a building for the O. W. I. The President in direct defiance of Congress built the building with blank-check funds. Congress sought to exclude certain subversive individuals from the Federal payroll. The President went out of his way to express his displeasure and to slap the people's Representatives in the face by advising both the executive and judicial departments that the action of Congress "is not in my judgment binding upon them." Congress has repeatedly expressed its opposition to subsidies and yet the Executive has placed part of the plan in operation.

Is it not clear, under every accepted definition of fascism that true fascism in one of its most malignant forms is entrenching itself in the very vitals of our system of economy? Are the men posing as liberals who are so busy these days attacking fascism so blind as not to see this threat to our own economy? They see it, I am sure, but in their mad attempts to put over their foreign ideologies, they constantly attempt to divert public attention away from our own economy in the hope that they can put over their plans for a socialized, planned economy while the American people are struggling with the problem of war.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

Mr. PATMAN. On that question of subsidy, the gentleman is in error.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield, and the gentleman from Texas knows the rules of this House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I merely wanted to ask a brief question and if the gentleman will yield I will be glad to withdraw the point. He is in error and we should not have an error go into the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. THOMASON]. The Chair will count. Forty-two Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was put, and the motion was rejected.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 150]

Anderson, Calif.	Ford	Morrison, La.
Andrews	Fulmer	Mott
Arnold	Furlong	Murphy
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	Norman
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Norrell
Barden	Gerlach	Norton
Barry	Goodwin	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Green	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Harris, Va.	O'Connor
Beall	Hart	O'Leary
Bender	Hébert	O'Toole
Bland	Heffernan	Pace
Bonner	Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.
Bradley, Mich.	Herter	Pfeiffer
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Philbin
Brehm	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Buckley	Hobbs	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Hooven	Pracht
Burchill, N. Y.	Holfield	Ramey
Butler	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Capozzoli	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Jackson	Robison, Ky.
Chapman	Jarman	Rogers, Calif.
Chenoweth	Johnson	Scanlon
Cole, N. Y.	Calvin D.	Schiffler
Courtney	Judd	Schuetz
Cox	Kean	Schwabe
Crawford	Kearney	Shafer
Crosser	Kee	Sheridan
Cullen	Kelley	Smith, Maine
D'Alessandro	Kennedy	Snyder
Dawson	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	King	Spence
Dickstein	Kirwan	Steagall
Dies	Kunkel	Taber
Dillweg	Lane	Taylor
Dirksen	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	Luce	Towe
Domengeaux	McCowen	Treadway
Douglas	McGehee	Vincent, Ky.
Eaton	McGranery	Vinson, Ga.
Eberharter	Maas	Vursell
Ellis	Mansfield,	Welch, Ohio
Fay	Mont.	Weiss
Feighan	Marcantonio	Wene
Fish	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Fisher	May	Winter
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Worley
Flannagan	Morrow	Wright
Fogarty	Miller, Pa.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 280 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin may continue.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker—
Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN FASCISM

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this observation: The gentleman now in the Well of the House was asked by one of his colleagues to yield. Upon his refusal to yield his colleague caused this roll to be called.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for the very fine exposition

of this subject he has given us up to this time, and to state that it will be well worth the while of every Member of this House to listen to the balance of it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I may say to my colleague that the gentleman who is now speaking was in no way responsible for this call of the House. I fully appreciated the few who were here upon the floor while I was speaking. May I say to you, however, that acting under what I conceive to be the clear rules of the House, I did decline to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARMAN]. He thereupon placed me in the embarrassing situation of either yielding to him or his forcing a call of the House by suggesting the absence of a quorum. I elected to let him pursue that course and the roll was called.

When I was interrupted by this demand for a quorum, I had defined the term "fascism" and indicated the necessity of critically exploring and examining our own economy with a view to determining whether under accepted definitions of fascism, this political philosophy was finding its way into our own economy.

Mr. Speaker, I will proceed with the discussion.

I recall asking one of the most prominent intellectual leftists in this country this question: "Do you think that continued delegation of arbitrary power to bureaucracy is a dangerous centralization of power?"

Answer: "I think it a very dangerous centralization of power."

"Have you been alarmed by the progress we have been making in the last few years toward centralization of power in the hands of bureaucracy?"

Answer: "I have been very much alarmed by it."

Certainly, if this intellectual leftist has been alarmed by what has been taking place in our own country, it is high time that the citizens who believe in liberty and freedom should begin to wake up. Freedom and liberty can never exist alone on mere sufferance, and they will fail unless courageously and vigorously defended.

Where are the men and women in whose veins flows the blood of the great liberals of the past? We are convinced that many of those who like to style themselves liberals are in reality the most reactionary group in the country. They are the ones who, while denouncing fascism are constantly planning and urging a program for an American domestic economy that is purely fascist in character. We are convinced that while comparatively few in number, they are well organized and highly articulate.

We are convinced, however, that the same spirit that motivated the thought and actions of the great liberal men and women of the past exists in the hearts and souls of an overwhelming majority of our citizens today. They are the true liberals. They may not be as articulate and as well organized as the entrenched groups of political gangsterism, but I have a profound faith that through the length and breadth of this land that

spirit is again inflamed. Mr. Speaker, there is born into the souls of men and women a craving for fundamental rights of liberty and freedom. The signers of the Declaration of Independence gave clear expression to this spirit when they wrote:

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The great liberals of that day, as exemplified by Thomas Jefferson, gave their all for the attainment of these fundamental rights. The struggle through the ages has been that of the common man trying to break through the restrictions of tyrannical kings and feudal lords in an effort to attain a place in life where liberty and freedom might prevail. History is replete with evidence of this continued battle. Courageous men and women shed their blood and gave their lives in the age-old effort to achieve liberty. The signing of the Magna Carta was a step in the direction of the attainment of such objectives. The French Revolution illustrates again the efforts of common people to take from tyrannical masters rights and privileges which the whole people in a properly managed society should enjoy. Those who courageously settled on this continent left European shores in order to establish their homes where they might find ecclesiastic and economic freedom and liberty. Yet there followed here onto this continent the long hand of oppressive government and tyranny. This was evidenced by Jefferson when he wrote in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence—

But when a long train of abuses and usurpation pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right—it is their duty—to throw off such government and provide new guards for their future security.

Jefferson did not counsel a break with a government long-established without good and sufficient reasons. He very meticulously specified the charges. I challenge every citizen, in view of the present social and economic conditions facing our Nation, to read the recital of those charges. What was the fundamental complaint that is found woven into the fabric of all of those charges? The signers of the Declaration of Independence complained in substance of the denial by a tyrannical king of the fundamental rights of free people to liberty and the pursuit of individual happiness. It is significant in viewing these specifications to point out that there is no complaint lodged against the King because he failed to furnish the colonists with suitable and proper housing or that he failed to provide suitable and proper nutrition or adequate hospitalization or medical care, or that he failed to protect them against the ravages of the Indians. No complaint will be found because he failed to establish proper standards of living or wage scales. But they did complain of the denial by the King of specific fundamental rights that free men

and women should enjoy. Listen to some of their complaints:

He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices and the amount and payment of their salaries. He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out of our substance. He has rendered the military independent of and superior to civil power. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws. He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

Thus, in charge after charge, the great liberal minds of the early days of our Republic gave expression to the demand for recognition by the tyrant of the fundamental rights of the people. Aided and guided by the assistance and advice of the courageous men who directed and fought a successful revolution, a new Government was gradually established under a Constitution having for its fundamental purpose the establishment of justice and the protection and preservation of human liberty and freedom. For more than 150 years, the great liberal-minded forces of this Nation have zealously guarded and protected the rights and privileges of the people.

The Congress of the United States is the repository under our system of government of the fundamental and inherent rights of a free people. We prospered as a nation under this system. I do not mean to imply that the fight to preserve individual freedom and liberty has always been successful. There are many black pages in our history that clearly demonstrate the power of entrenched privilege. Fundamentally, however, the fight of the great liberal minds of our Nation has always been to preserve in the hands of the people these fundamental rights of freedom and liberty which found expression in our original Declaration of Independence. They conceived the Government to be an arbiter between the elements of special privilege and the rights of the common man. They conceived that government was an instrument to provide equality of opportunity for all the people, so that the poorest child in the Nation might, through perseverance and ability, achieve the highest position in the land.

In recent years, due to claimed social and economic crises, following one after the other, we have witnessed in this country a complete reversal of governmental attitude. Powers and privileges that should belong to the people's representatives in government and for which liberal souls through the ages shed their blood to obtain and preserve, have recklessly been delegated under alleged "democratic process" to a coordinate branch of government. The result has been that we have shifted the responsibility in large measure from the people's representatives into the hands of Federal bureaus piled upon Federal bureaus. In actual practice, these powers have been delegated to the President. He has set up one bureau after another in order to handle the mass of complex and conflicting social and economic problems that subservient Congresses have been apparently unable to solve for themselves.

We believe it fair to state that this abject surrender by the people's representatives of legislative responsibility, while technically achieved through democratic process, was in reality coerced and compelled by Executive intervention. The direct result of this shifting of responsibility is plainly apparent. We are now being ruled from above by a multitude of directives and regulations issued by a grasping, giant bureaucracy. They are the result of the whims, attitudes, and caprices of mere men who owe no responsibility to an electorate, but nevertheless they have the full force and effect of law.

Citizens today throughout the length and breadth of this great Republic are feeling the whiplash of bureaucratic process. These bureaucratic agencies of government, being operated by mere human beings, are lustful in their grasp for power. The result has been a duplication and multiplication and confusion of powers, all of which has resulted in a situation where the people of the Nation are now at last beginning to realize what being ruled by mere men instead of law means.

Do not misapprehend or misinterpret what I am saying. I fully realize that in order to conduct a successful global war, great grants of power, necessary for quick decision, must be lodged in the Executive. The difficulty, however, arises from the fact that this complexity of bureaucratic control over the lives and fortunes of the people of America, much of it unrelated to the war effort, was well under way long before Pearl Harbor. The exigencies of war have only added to the lust and grasp for more and more power. Is it not clear, therefore, that this centralization of power in the hands of the Executive, who is surrounded by a small group of "inner cabinet" advisors, results in effect in placing in the hands of one man or a small group of men the power to control the lives, liberty, and fortunes of the people? Does not this present situation meet every accepted test of Fascist government?

The defenders of this philosophy will immediately exclaim that it was accomplished through the medium of democratic process and that it is expanded and continued only because of the exigencies of war. As to the first of these contentions, I believe it only fair to state that in the delegation of power and authority to the Executive, Congress itself is charged with the responsibility. I do feel, however, that the influence of Executive persuasion manifested through the medium of tempting Federal judgeships or other juicy jobs, patronage, Treasury raids, useless spending, and the usual trappings of the spoils system, did away with much of the semblance of democratic process in the time before the war when these great grants of power were abjectly transferred to the Executive.

If we could be assured that it was the purpose and intention of the executive department of government to return these powers to the people at the conclusion of the war, we might not be so apprehensive. The fact is, however,

that the propaganda is well under way now to try to make it clear that these emergent controls over the lives of our people must be retained in our post-war economy. These bureaucrats who have exercised such unlimited power will not surrender willingly when the crisis of war shall have passed. The American people are willing to sweat and to serve and to sacrifice in order to accomplish the ends of a just and lasting peace. More and more people, however, are becoming disturbed by the fact that this pattern of government now in vogue, most of it legally supposed to be temporary in character, may become a permanent pattern of government under a system of planned and controlled economy. There must be no interference with the necessary controls and regimentation incident to the successful prosecution of our war effort. It must be made clear, however, that we do not intend to permanently submit to the surrender of our fundamental rights when peace and order shall have been restored to the world. We insist that these great grants of power that have been thrust into the hands of the Executive shall be restored to the people through their Representatives in the Congress, and that any changes in our economy made necessary by post-war conditions shall result from congressional action rather than Executive order or decree. We insist that assurances be given that the pattern of government incident to national crises shall not be insidiously fastened upon us as a permanent pattern of government. We in this Nation want to be governed by law and not by the whims and caprices of mere men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, I would like to ask the gentleman to correct one statement he made to the effect that the President had gone contrary to the Congress on the question of subsidies. The last declaration, I will state to the gentleman, that Congress passed on was in favor of subsidies, and we have not made any declaration since that time. To that extent I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that his statement was in error.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, we want no return to the so-called good old days when entrenched privilege pillaged and raped the natural resources of our country and attempted to use the common people merely as pawns for the achievement of their own positions of affluence. On the other hand, neither do we want acceptance of a national economy, Fascist in character, based upon foreign ideologies.

We fully realize the responsibility of government in providing for human welfare. We know that governments are instituted to protect the people against special privilege, and that as conditions

change and society becomes more complex, it becomes the duty and obligation of government, through the enactment of just and equitable laws passed by the people's representatives, to provide for justice and equality of opportunity. We conceive it to be the duty of the Government not to act in the role of tyrant and master through the issuance of Executive decrees, but rather to provide safeguards for freedom of action and freedom to work by assuming the role of constant arbiter between human rights and special privilege.

My colleagues, it is time for the people of America, regardless of party, to stop this Fascist threat here at home.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made a very fine historical speech, and most of us agree with him so far as his history is concerned. The gentleman, however, conveyed a message, or by innuendo left an impression, which is entirely without justification. He in his speech gave no bill of particulars.

What bill has been passed in the last 10 years, as he claims, that has a tendency toward fascism? In 1933, when the banks were threatened with destruction and when the President of the United States saved the banks and the deposits of 20,000,000 people; was that fascism? When the present administration under the leadership of President Roosevelt saved business, does the gentleman from Wisconsin say that was fascism? When he stepped in to help the millions of unemployed, innocent victims of the depression, and those dependent upon them, does the gentleman from Wisconsin say that constituted fascism?

I went to the church my conscience dictated me to go to yesterday morning. I know of no American whose freedom and liberties have been interfered with. I feel stronger today in the possession of those rights that make up personal liberty than I did 12 years ago when we were in the throes of an economic conflagration.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is shooting at the wrong target. He would be better off if he used as his target Hitler and Nazi Germany, Hirohito and vicious and imperialistic Japan, instead of a target that tends to bring about division among our people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WAGE INCREASE FOR RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to invite the attention of the Congress to a manifest injustice which should not only challenge its interest, but should also enlist the support of every impartial Member of this body.

More than a year has elapsed since the railroad employees of America sought in

a peaceful and orderly manner to obtain a raise in their rate of pay comparable to the rise in the cost of living. Every fair-minded citizen who espouses the cause of economic justice and who recognizes the tremendous job that is being done so well by the railroads of this country under difficult conditions, realizes that the credit is largely due to the efficiency and fidelity of the employees of this great industry.

No one can deny that during this period an amicable settlement has been sought of this question, or that the employees have steadfastly followed and scrupulously complied with existing legislation. They have tried to compose their differences within the framework of the machinery set up to determine such questions.

These men have played the game fairly and have patiently followed the processes of negotiation and adjustment, while wage increases have been granted to compensate for the existing inequities in other industries.

Who are the men of whom I speak? They are some of the finest citizens of my district, of my State, and of the Nation. They are, first of all, fundamentally American. They believe in our form of government and support its institutions. They help provide for the maintenance of our schools, colleges, and churches. They frequently take an active interest in the affairs of their community. They buy bonds cheerfully and pay taxes with a minimum of muttering, as they unselfishly send their sons to battle, while they keep the wheels of transportation rolling and the sinews of war flowing to every front. No one appreciates more than they the gravity of the great struggle in which we are now engaged. No group of American labor is more devoted to the successful prosecution of this war or more determined to bring it to a victorious conclusion than are these men. Many of them, as well as the members of their families, are in the armed forces.

How big is their job and how well are they doing it? Without burdening you with a detailed recital of statistics, suffice it to say that in 1918 at peak performance, the railroads transported slightly over 400,000,000 ton-miles of freight, and handled about 43,000,000 miles of passenger travel. However, in 1942, with one-third less locomotives, one-fourth less freight cars in use, and 1,000,000 less employees than in 1918, these same roads transported over 630,000,000 ton-miles of freight, and handled 54,000,000 miles of passenger travel.

This is an amazing record which, according to reliable statistics, will be far surpassed this year—a matchless epic of performance, which is all the more impressive when you consider the difficulties under which the job is being done. The extraordinary demands made upon the railroads in wartime do not permit its equipment and rolling stock to be maintained at near perfection levels. Instead, the tremendous drain upon transportation facilities has made it necessary to do the best with what was available.

Railroading under normal conditions is a hazardous occupation, but in the stress of wartime, with insistent demands for the immediate delivery of precious cargoes of freight and passengers, it becomes doubly dangerous. Those engaged in this important industry must be mentally and physically fit. They must be able to withstand the rigors of temperatures ranging from 100° above to 50° below zero. They must accept snow, ice, and sleet in some sections and seasons as a matter of course, while at the same time seeing that the trains get through. Death frequently lurks in defective rails and switches, and from unseen and unsuspected sources misfortune stealthily strikes and able-bodied men are transformed into physical wrecks and hopeless cripples.

Truly, this is an industry that taxes the employee's physical capacity and health to the limits of human endurance. Yet these men have never spent an idle hour in the past 20 years because of strikes. They have never failed or faltered on the job. The record of their service is one of continuous devotion to duty and an abiding solicitation for the care of the property, equipment, and lives entrusted to their custody.

These men have bought millions of dollars worth of War bonds out of their earnings and savings, and I am reliably informed that they have applied for more War bonds than the Treasury has allotted them. This they do as they conceive it to be their duty as good citizens. They would like to continue the purchase of these bonds in the future in even greater amounts than in the past. But let me remind you that with the increase in taxes and the cost of living, together with the diminished family income due to so many of its members being in the armed forces, they will have to forego further purchases of bonds unless substantial adjustments are made in their wages and made now.

Unless this is done, what do you expect to happen to the morale of these men? Their faith in and their loyalty to the service has been attested in the following words which were taken from a report of the Lane Commission:

That there has been such steadfast loyalty to the railroads, and so slight a disposition to use the lever of their necessity and their opportunity to compel by ruthless action an increase of wages is not without significance, and should not be passed without public recognition.

Mr. Speaker, that loyalty so eloquently referred to might quickly disappear and might easily turn to bitterness and dismay. This must not happen. The grave injustice of this situation can certainly be avoided by the simple expedient of approving an increase in wages for these loyal Americans, which will enable them to meet the rise in the cost of living and help carry the burdens of present-day taxation.

It must be remembered that no differences exist between management and labor at present regarding a raise in pay for the nonoperating railroad men. Both parties are agreed there should be an increase in pay of at least 8 cents an hour. But one bureaucrat here in

Washington in his imperious wisdom brushes aside this agreement and substitutes his caprice for the combined judgment of the men who best understand this problem—that is, the management and the Brotherhoods.

The railroads recognize that with increased business and improved earnings, they can afford a raise in pay of 8 cents an hour. It might be well to recall that in 1932, when the railroads were suffering, as all other businesses were suffering, a severe depression, the employees of the railroads took a cut of 10 percent in their earnings, and they did this out of a spirit of fairness, feeling that they should take note of the financial difficulties under which the roads were operating, and that they should help to keep the railroads running.

Intelligent management realizes the importance of keeping labor happy and contented, and in this instance, intelligent management has combined with labor in bringing about and seeking the approval of a wage adjustment.

What is the record of the Government in dealing with this particular problem? Why does it callously continue to refuse to approve of the raise agreed upon and frustrate the work and purposes of the management and the employees of the railroads? The patience of the employees has been taxed to the limit. The failure and refusal of an agency of the Government to approve the adjustments agreed upon is not only discouraging to everyone but demoralizing to the industry itself.

The records of this case disclose that in September 1942 the representatives of the railroad employees notified the companies of their desire to obtain an increase of 20 cents an hour, with a minimum hourly wage of 70 cents. The management denied this request. Then, in December 1942, management and the representatives of the employees endeavored to compromise their differences; and when this failed, the Mediation Board, in January 1943, undertook hearings. And when the interested parties were unable to reach an agreement, the President in February of 1943 issued Executive Orders Nos. 9172 and 9299, and appointed an Emergency Board to consider the question. Thereupon, after the Board had held numerous hearings in May of 1943 it recommended an increase in wages of 8 cents an hour. However, in June of 1943, Mr. Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, without any apparent justification and in complete defiance of the recommendations of the Emergency Board, denied an increase in pay. Then, in August of 1943, the management of the railroads and the representatives of the Brotherhoods reached an agreement based upon the findings and the recommendations of the Emergency Board increasing the rate of pay 8 cents an hour.

Since that time, Mr. Vinson has been in a complete official eclipse, insofar as the settlement of this question is concerned. He has done nothing, while the employees of the railroads have continued to carry on faithfully and un-

selfishly in the performance of their work. The railroads have been kept running and they have met the demands which the traffic of a nation at war has made upon them.

The official inaction of Mr. Vinson is matched only by his lack of understanding and appreciation of the importance of a solution of this problem now to the employees of the railroads and the industry itself.

It is an admitted fact that the rate of pay of the average railroad employee as compared with that of men of similar skill in other industries is concededly low. For example, skilled mechanics in railroad work receive only 95 cents an hour, whereas the rate of pay in other industries for the same work is considerably higher. In fact, the experienced railroad mechanic is paid a wage about equal to that of unskilled labor in certain other industries, yet unskilled labor of railroads receives as little as 46 cents an hour.

These men must pay the same rent, the same grocery bill, the same insurance, and virtually the same taxes as others receiving a higher rate of pay. In the end, there is little left for the railroad employee except the consolation that comes from the permanence of such a job by reason of the seniority gained through long years of service.

These men have not received increases in pay to the extent of 15 percent as recognized by the Little Steel formula, although that is the yardstick which has been used to provide the means for those in other industries to meet the rise in the cost of living.

Everyone devoutly hopes that it will not be necessary for the railroad employees of this Nation to resort to any other measures in order to obtain that which management agrees they are justly entitled to, and which every fair-minded American covets with the case approves. Let me remind you that should these men become disgusted with the delay in disposing of this matter, and should a break-down occur in our transportation system, then this regrettable result would be due solely to official obstinacy and ineptitude, and what I believe to be administration maneuvering. The administration, in my judgment, is playing politics with wage-adjustment demands of railroad labor and thereby jeopardizing the efficiency of the Nation's transportation.

Mr. Speaker, it requires no strained construction of this deplorable affair to say that it bears all the earmarks of being made a political football. Mr. Vinson is the personal appointee of the President. So far as we know, he possesses little or no experience in the operation of a railroad and no interest in the mutual agreements of its management and employees. Mr. Vinson is not only the President's appointee but his alter ego in this matter. It is proper to conclude that Mr. Vinson was either acting under the orders or with the consent of the President in setting aside the recommendations of the Emergency Board and in since failing to approve the settlement

reached by the railroads and the representatives of their employees.

To say that the President did not know of and did not approve of the conduct of Mr. Vinson in this case would be to conclude that the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth. Is there politics in this equation? Does the President propose at the eleventh hour to make a triumphant entry upon the scene, then dramatically override Mr. Vinson and have another board approve this agreement? And then claim that all the while he was the stalwart friend of labor and had saved them from this sickening situation?

It is not only well worth watching, but one could safely hazard the prediction that the President will at the appropriate time insist upon some other board or agency overriding Mr. Vinson's order and then claim the credit for the very small raise in wages to which everyone concedes these men are so justly entitled.

Mr. Speaker, the solution of this question does not lie with the Congress. It is beyond the power of Congress to intervene or to push Mr. Vinson off official dead center. However, the inexcusable delay and the responsibility for the failure to settle this question rests squarely upon the shoulders of the President and his personal appointee, Mr. Vinson.

The time is ripe—rotten ripe—for official action calling for the immediate approval of the agreement to raise the rate of wages of both operating and non-operating railroad employees.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman's masterly presentation in behalf of the American railway worker and his condemnation of politics being played with the wage stabilization question. The gentleman has put the oil where the squeak is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. James Patton, president of the Farmers' Union, and a letter to him from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

TAXES AND INFLATION

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss a most important matter which affects the whole of the American people. I do not know of any proposal which is of more importance and demands as much attention as the question of taxation. The Treasury De-

partment has submitted to the Congress a request for the raising of ten and one-half billion annually in additional taxes. Secretary Morgenthau has emphasized to the Ways and Means Committee that should Congress follow his recommendations in raising this vast sum of money, the inflation spiral would be controlled and checked. Whether the full estimate should be provided at this time or a lesser amount, I will not attempt to discuss. To say the least, it is necessary that a tax bill be enacted as speedily as possible in order to meet the great demands of our war machine and to keep our Federal financial structure secure. It is the method by which the Secretary of the Treasury recommends that the revenues be raised that is so objectionable to anyone who would consider the facts.

Under the Treasury's proposal the taxpayer having a net income of \$6,000 before personal exemptions were considered, would pay up to 28.3 percent, depending upon his family status. A person having a net income of \$8,000 annually would pay up to 32 percent; \$10,000 up to 35.5 percent; \$15,000 up to 43.5 percent. The taxpayer would also be required to pay the 25 percent of the 1942 tax, one-half of which will be due and payable on March 15, 1944, and the remaining one-half on March 15, 1945. In addition to this, the State income tax and the other taxes he must also pay. Such heavy taxes would have the tendency to disrupt the plans of hundreds of thousands of families who are struggling to pay for their homes, purchase insurance, and educate their children. The Treasury's suggestion would relieve nine to ten million persons from the payment of the Victory tax and transfer this burden to the taxpayers in the upper brackets.

Recently I received a letter from a constituent who is an attorney, with regard to the excess tax burden now being borne by the middle income group. I quote from his letter:

Following is a comparison of my United States income taxes for the past 3 years:

	Taxable income	Tax
1940.....	\$6,416.96	\$155.13
1941.....	6,540.82	610.78
1942.....	7,998.68	1,531.61

For 1940 and 1941 the taxable income was practically the same, but the tax was practically quadrupled.

As between 1940 and 1942 the increase in income was approximately 25 percent, but the increase in taxes was practically 900 percent. The increase in income was \$1,524.86, and the increase in tax was \$1,376.48, which took all but \$205.24 of the additional income, or more than 80 percent of it.

The 10 p. m. Columbia newscast on July 8 of this year included a Department of Commerce release stating that the cost of living was up 27 percent, wages were up 67 percent, and corporation profits were at an all-time high; and the commentator's conclusion was that salaried and professional classes "are taking the rap." The Commercial Appeal of July 23 carried a dispatch dated at Washington on July 22 attributing to the Department of Commerce a prophecy that by the

end of the year savings and bank deposits may reach \$100,000,000,000. In all of these statistics, the only one that affects the professional classes is the high cost of living.

We read almost daily that there must be new and higher taxes. Will they be made still higher for the fellow who has already been raised 900 percent in 2 years? Or will they be made higher for the people whose cash in bank is approaching one hundred billions?

If I am correct in thinking that an enormous inequity exists under the present pattern of income-tax law, cannot this discrimination be removed?

Should the proposal of Secretary Morgenthau be put into effect, this person's tax would be increased from \$1,531.61 annually to approximately \$2,500, an additional tax of about 60 percent.

The leaders of the Republican Party have announced that it will not favor an increase in the present individual income taxes, yet it gives no alternative or remedy for raising the badly needed revenue.

The administration has continued peacetime practices, including the 40-hour week with time and a half for overtime. On our Federal pay roll are 3,000,000 civilian employees. No wonder there is a necessity for the passage of additional tax legislation. Mr. Morgenthau made no mention of retrenchment in the operation of the departments of Government. I do not propose to cut necessary war appropriations one red copper cent; however, I am of the firm opinion that bureaus of the Federal Government can be consolidated and some of them eliminated completely. Much saving of useless spending has been brought about either through congressional action or forced upon the executive branch of the Government by Congress since Pearl Harbor. I refer to the abolition of the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the reduction in the appropriation for the domestic propaganda program of the Office of War Information, and others. It is imperative that Congress take definite steps to eliminate waste of public funds. This can, in a measure, be accomplished by a reduction of 300,000 employees from the Federal pay roll. This reduction in personnel can be effectuated without injuring the necessary governmental processes. It would make for more efficiency. In the year 1942 the Federal pay roll totaled \$4,396,000,000. By cutting off 300,000 this would approximate one-tenth of the Federal employees and would result in a saving of \$500,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very fine statement the gentleman is making. I agree with him in the splendid effort he is making to reduce expenses of government, especially with reference to nondefense activities. I wonder if the gentleman has seen the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that already during 1943 more than 100,000 employees have been dismissed from the Federal service.

Mr. GATHINGS. The Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman from Oklahoma is one of the ranking members, has made considerable headway toward economy, but more must be done. The reports I have read with regard to the civilian employees of the Government show that there has been a steady increase in their number, although the increase is not now as pronounced as it was 6 months or a year ago. However, with 2,600 lawyers in the Office of Price Administration doing work that could be accomplished by 100 lawyers, I am of the firm opinion that several hundred of them could be eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. Let me compliment him on the fine effort he has made in that direction. May I add that when the bill carrying the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration was under consideration I offered an amendment that would slice \$50,000,000 from that appropriation.

Mr. GATHINGS. I recall that the gentleman did that. And that is not the first slash in governmental expenditures for which my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma has been responsible.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation at their quarterly meeting, September 3, 1943, adopted the following resolution:

We believe that fiscal and tax policies should be adopted that will retard inflation, that will be as nearly possible on a pay-as-you-go basis and will encourage the system of free enterprise.

I wanted to give the House the benefit of the thoughts and observations of that great farm organization.

Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1943, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial headed "Taxes—Or Inflation." It reads as follows:

If a satisfactory and adequate tax bill is not passed before the end of the year—if, as now seems possible, no tax bill whatever can be agreed upon—a serious inflation will be that much nearer. And the responsibility for this outcome will fall both upon the administration and upon the Republicans in Congress. Both sides now seem to be maneuvering with an eye principally on the 1944 campaign. Neither is facing up to the grim economic realities.

Let it be said to the credit of the administration that in the over-all amount it proposes to raise it has set its sights high. Its request for added revenues of \$10,500,000,000 implies at least some recognition of the real dimensions of the inflationary gap. But, having set this goal, the Treasury proposed a set of taxes that failed to meet the situation. It was the Secretary of the Treasury himself who said: "We know where the bulk of the new money lies and where therefore lies also the greatest danger of inflationary pressure. Today four-fifths of all the income of the Nation is going to people earning less than \$5,000 a year." He then put forward a program that was directed mainly against the other fifth of the national income. Indeed, his new program even proposed to exempt 9,000,000 present income taxpayers.

The administration has set itself against the one remaining tax that could yield substantial revenues and really reach the bulk of the country's income—a sales tax. Against such a tax it has brought extraordinary arguments. It has said that a sales tax would be inflationary. It has said that labor would

not stand for such a tax and would demand wage increases to compensate for it.

Let us see what it is that the Treasury is saying here, and what it is that it is approving. As a result of the war there has been a sharp curtailment of the volume of civilian goods remaining for consumers. The President and other spokesmen for the administration have again and again pointed out that because of this situation everyone must make sacrifices. But what has happened to industrial wages? Since the outbreak of the war living costs in this country have risen an average of 22 percent, hourly earnings of industrial workers have risen 41.8 percent, and weekly earnings of the same group have risen 69.3 percent. This means that industrial workers have not only retained their proportional share in national consumption, they have not only maintained as large an absolute consumption as ever, but they have actually increased their absolute command of civilian goods since the outbreak of war. This must mean that they have done all this at the expense of remaining groups in the country. Now administration spokesmen go before Congress and say, in effect, that industrial labor, which has made such gains, must not even be reached by a tax. The administration is telling such labor that it would in fact be justified in refusing to shoulder a tax and in trying to shift it on to someone else.

The argument that a sales tax would be inflationary does not deserve serious discussion, it is, in fact, perhaps the greatest single weapon remaining to us to curb inflation. The great cost of the war cannot be put on 5 percent of the population or even on one-fifth of the population. The increase of more than 20 percent in the cost of living that has already occurred since the beginning of the war is the equivalent of more than a 20-percent sales tax on every family in the country, with no exemptions whatever. The only difference is that no revenue from this unofficial sales tax goes to the Government to help pay for the war. It is dissipated among private groups.

But what of the Republican leadership in Congress? It sees the weakness of the administration's tax program. But it is apparently afraid to support a sales tax because of the political capital that it fears the administration would make of such support. Therefore, largely ignoring the extent of the inflationary danger, it talks as if no substantial increase in taxes were really necessary. It talks much of cutting out "wasteful" public expenditures.

The potential economies that could be made without danger to the war effort are great. But all economies are specific. The President can spend nothing that Congress does not authorize, and there are few expenditures that Republicans have had the courage not to approve. "We likewise recommend," said a statement of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee a few days ago, "that the President study the possibility of eliminating waste and extravagance in military expenditures." It has always been the duty of congressional committees to examine critically every request for expenditures for no matter what alleged purpose. Congressional committees cannot shirk this duty and then put the sole blame on the President for the result.

We are unlikely to get a satisfactory and adequate tax bill unless both the administration and the Republican Members of Congress display much more fiscal candor and courage than they have up to the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, every major war in history has been accompanied by inflation. The cruelest of all war taxes, and one most disastrous to the poor, is the hidden tax of inflation. Already war inflation

has imposed upon the American people a hidden tax of 25 percent, which for the poor is equivalent to a 25-percent gross income tax. Eric A. Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, predicts for us an additional increase in the cost of living of 25 percent in 1944. All are agreed that the \$156,000,000,000 of estimated national income for the year 1944 will exceed the total of available goods and services at present prices by at least \$40,000,000,000. There are varying estimates of what percent of that inflationary gap will go into voluntary savings, but the most accepted estimate is \$20,000,000,000. This would leave an additional \$20,000,000,000 of "hot money" to enter the market place in competition for a diminishing supply of consumer goods. If, in the fall of 1936 and spring of 1937, the spending of a billion and a half of soldier bonus money gave us a temporary boom, when there was no curb on production, the inflationary effect of 13 times that sum may well be imagined. For the current fiscal year the Treasury Department estimates expenditures for all purposes at \$107,000,000,000 and revenue at current rates at \$39,000,000,000, exclusive of social-security taxes which would add \$1,200,000,000 of trust-fund money, which would later be replaced. State and local taxes are estimated at \$10,000,000,000. If we withdraw for governmental and war purposes a total of \$51,000,000,000 from the American people, they will still have left twice the amount of money they had during the depression years of 1932, 1933, and 1934, although the goods available for domestic consumption will probably sink to the level of those depression years, at least in volume.

In this emergency we need to encourage thrift, pay off debts, buy War bonds, insurance, and contribute to other forms of personal savings. It is necessary during this war that a wage control be effective. It is also essential that we siphon off surplus purchasing power through taxation in order to reduce Government borrowing from the commercial banks, which is definitely inflationary. We should at the same time curb reckless spending in Government departments, which is definitely deflationary. Four-fifths of the entire national income is in the hands of those income earners whose wages are \$5,000 a year or less, and two-thirds of the total income of the country is in the hands of those making \$3,000 or less. The only practical, fair, and feasible way of reaching that great volume of war income is by means of consumer taxes. A wartime tax should serve two purposes—to raise a maximum of badly needed revenue and to discourage the inflationary purchase of scarce goods. The sales tax does both—it would permit income tax exemptions to be raised; it would establish a convenient and equitable method in which everyone would contribute to the financing of the war. In applying consumer taxes, the express provision should be written into the act that farm machinery, tools, implements, fertilizer, seed, and feed for cattle, hogs, and poultry should be exempt from such tax. Further increase

in personal taxes curtails savings and dries up gifts to charity and at the same time only has little effect upon inflationary spending.

Additional income taxes plus reduction of personal exemptions, to bring other taxpayers into the income-tax field, will further complicate a tax structure already so involved that it approaches the point of unworkability. The increase in the personal income-tax rate will eliminate the profit incentive motive, leaving many with nothing except the spirit of patriotism to urge them to increased effort at a time when increased production is vital. The charge that a sales tax, known to be deflationary, can be made the instrument of inflation through wage increases can easily be met by a statutory provision that war sales taxes, like war income taxes, be considered by no Government agency in establishing an index of the cost of living or in considering demands for wage increases. The charge that a sales tax will fall with undue severity upon the very poor can easily be answered by the issuance of stamps in amounts sufficient to offset the impact of the new tax. Another method also could be used, and that is to increase income-tax exemptions, particularly for the married man with a family.

That will leave only the political argument against the sales-tax proposal which charges that organized labor is opposed even in a grave war emergency to any tax system that requires everyone to contribute something and which no one can successfully evade.

I cannot believe that the American Congress will fail to measure up to its responsibilities by courageously providing needed revenue for our gallant heroes who are so bravely fighting for the continuation of American ideals and principles. The sales tax is the practical and logical solution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have followed the gentleman's address with a great deal of interest. I certainly think he has given us considerable food for thought. I notice the gentleman recommends certain exemptions, and I believe that probably if the sales tax is put into effect it will be necessary to have certain exemptions, or else you are just going around and around.

The question I wish to ask is this: What amount of revenue could reasonably be expected to be derived from a sales tax if there are exempted the items mentioned in the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is expected that there would be derived from \$5,800,000,000 to \$6,200,000,000 from such a tax.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is that on the basis of a 10-percent retail tax?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, on a 10-percent consumers' tax.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman exempt only those items he mentioned in his remarks, farm tools, farm machinery, and things used in the production of food, as I gather it?

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct. I would exempt those things just as I would exempt the articles that go into the production of food crops and other agricultural crops, food, and fiber.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman exempt food, medicine, things essential for everyday living, or would he include them?

Mr. GATHINGS. The object of such a tax as I see it is to produce the needed revenue and reduce consumer purchases of scarce merchandise. This question should be carefully weighed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman believe a sales tax would be the most effective way of discouraging unnecessary spending?

Mr. GATHINGS. Absolutely. There is no doubt at all but that the sales tax is the only reasonable and proper solution to discourage the spending of money by those who draw high wages from war employment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman may recall that 2 or 3 years ago the Treasury Department suggested some kind of a spending tax. I believe at that time not much attention was given to it, but I have often wondered if there would not be a great deal of merit in resurrecting that spending tax at this particular time and placing a rather steep tax or penalty on unnecessary spending. I am wondering if that would not prove to be a much greater deterrent to spending than would a consumer's retail sales tax.

Mr. GATHINGS. That should be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, but that would not take the place of a sales tax which is needed to get the revenue and which treats all alike. I believe we should all bear the burden of the cost of this war in which we are now engaged. In my judgment, the sales tax is the best way to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore adopted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED LIVESTOCK CEILING PRICES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration has announced a new method of dealing with ceiling prices on meat. Under the present situation the ceiling price is fixed on meat sold at wholesale and on retail sales. It is now proposed the sale of beef shall be controlled by the reflected value of the animal after it has been slaughtered. In other words, the packer and the processor will buy live cattle subject to the grade of meat after they have been slaughtered. For example, choice steers will have a maximum live price of \$16. Good steers will bring a top price of \$15.25; medium grade cattle, \$13; common grades, \$11; cutters and cannors, \$8.25. These are the maximum prices that may be paid, and minimum prices of approximately \$1 per hundred are proposed, and the packer and processor will continue to receive the subsidies now being paid of \$1.10 per hundred live weight. This, in my judgment, is impractical and wholly unworkable. There are so many

different kinds and classes of livestock that it is almost impossible to put them into the classes and categories indicated under such proposal. You just cannot put two or three dozen different kinds and classes of cattle in a half dozen strait jackets and make it work. The proposal, I am advised, does not have the approval of any livestock organization nor the meat board. I do not think it even has the approval of the War Food Administration.

Several months ago the Office of Price Administration ordered a roll-back on the retail price of beef of about 10 percent and agreed to make up the difference by paying a subsidy from the Federal Treasury. The price of live cattle immediately went down more than \$1 per hundred pounds, and since then has declined all the way from \$1 to \$3 per hundred. A subsidy of \$1.10 per hundred has been paid ever since the roll-back order to packers and processors of this country. It might interest you to know that more than \$3,500,000 has already been paid in support of the roll-back order. Of course, the farmer and stockmen did not get any of the money. They just got the roll-back. The \$3,500,000 was paid to the packers. Also let me remind you again that although meat is a most important item of food it constitutes less than one-fourth of the amount the average consumer spends for food. The farmer gets only a small share of that. Now it is proposed under this order that no one has agreed to except officials in the Office of Price Administration, that livestock men and farmers shall be further regulated by an attempt to put ceiling prices on live cattle, but they propose to do it by the way of the back door.

Mr. Speaker, all of the rules and regulations that have been ordered by the Office of Price Administration on meat and livestock have confounded and confused the farmers and livestock men to a place where they not only have been discouraged but have crowded the livestock markets with cattle, with runs that have outnumbered our markets in many years. Three weeks ago there were more cattle on the principal markets of this country than we had in more than 25 years. Here are some figures. During the period of September 13 and ending with September 27 this year there were 861,400 cattle sold on our 12 principal markets. A year ago the figure was 100,000 less. Thousands of these cattle should have been finished but went to slaughter pens. Just last Monday, a week ago today, there were 64,800 cattle sold on the Kansas City market, the largest for any market in the world's history. Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers of this country are entitled to a fair deal. They should not have and do not expect exorbitant profits for their products, but they are entitled to have the assurance from their Government that they shall have a fair price for their products on a basis of what they are required to pay for the things they buy.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has asked our farmers and producers to in-

crease the production of food. The American producers are willing to do everything they can to comply with that request. After all, they are among the most patriotic of American citizens. They want to do their share and more. All they ask is for a fair deal at the hands of their Government. I just do not believe they are getting it. The paralyzing of the livestock market by the Office of Price Administration regulations is bound to show up in a shortage of meat within the next year. All of which is unnecessary and without justification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for 10 minutes.

AUDITING OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1942, I introduced a resolution to cancel Executive Orders 9001 and 9023. These resolutions are the subject matter of testimony of Comptroller General Warren before the Military Affairs Committee. Had the resolution been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee and voted upon by the House, there would have been no necessity for Mr. Warren appearing before the Military Affairs Committee. The resolution 284 that I introduced on February 25, 1942, would have canceled the Executive orders that give the War Department purchasing officers power to audit their own contracts to the exclusion of the Comptroller General's Office.

Mr. Warren claims that by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, he is entitled to audit all contracts of the executive departments. The Executive orders removed the power of the Comptroller General over War Department, Maritime and Navy Department contracts for the manufacture of the sinews of war, and nine other agencies.

I sought at that time, and I am seeking again today, to have the Executive orders canceled. If the Congress adopts my resolution which I am reintroducing today, some 12 agencies of the Government will not have the power to audit their own contracts. The Comptroller General will have that power. It is significant that the Comptroller General did not urge the adoption of my resolution in February of 1942. The legislation before the Military Affairs Committee to which the Comptroller General is addressing his remarks now only touch upon the relationship of the General Accounting Office and the War Department. If my resolution is adopted, the same one I introduced in February of 1942, the issue will be met with 12 agencies that have been added to the list by the President with power to audit their own accounts to the exclusion of the Comptroller General.

There is only the matter of \$5,000,000,000 involved in the War Department contracts; there is much more than this in the \$220,000,000,000 unexpended balances for war purposes that the Comptroller General ought to audit for these 12 agencies.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, will you not look into this problem and see if good government does not demand and require that a separate agency like the General Accounting Office fulfill its responsibility under the Budget and Accounting Act to audit all of these war contracts?

I notice in Business Week the following article:

A WHIP TO CRACK?—NEW UNIT MAY COMPOSE DIFFERENCES OVER TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS AND RECONVERSION, BUT WHO'LL HANDLE THE SETTLEMENTS?

Now that the White House has taken a hand, it looks as though the free-for-all fight over termination of Government contracts will end in a series of compromises.

NEW POLICY UNIT

Acting on the President's orders, War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes has just set up a new unit to work out policies for termination and post-war conversion.

Procurement officers think that with O. W. M. cracking the whip, the services at last will get together and agree on the uniform termination policy they have been kicking around since the start of the war.

JOB FOR CONGRESS

Although establishment of the new O. W. M. unit will simplify things, it won't solve the big problem of whether settlements on canceled contracts shall be handled by the procurement agencies or by the General Accounting Office. That is still a job for Congress.

Until a few weeks ago, the services were making termination payments on their own, assuming that their legal authority to make contracts gave them power to settle up when they canceled an order. Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren kicked the props from under this theory with a letter to Congress insisting that his General Accounting Office was the only outfit with the authority to take care of claims against the Government.

A DEEPER SPLIT

The split between the services and the Comptroller General is something more than an ordinary consequence of departmental imperialism.

The procurement agencies are thinking primarily in terms of getting money out fast, so that contractors will have enough working capital to start reconversion to peacetime production.

G. A. O. is thinking of the possibility of padded claims and fraudulent cost estimates that may slip past if termination settlements aren't audited like any other disbursement.

COMPROMISE SPIRIT

As things look now, Congress will try to straddle the fence. One proposal that appeals to a good many Congressmen is to delegate G. A. O. representatives to work with the procurement officers on termination settlements. Should the G. A. O. man make no protest, the Army or Navy could arrange settlement and make final payment. In any case that looked suspicious, the G. A. O. representative could call for a detailed audit.

The big hitch here is that the Comptroller General doesn't have a large enough staff to put a man on every settlement team.

Ordinarily, G. A. O. would have no objection to expanding, but the current shortage of accountants and trained contract men may rule out the idea.

CENTRAL BOARD?

To economize on G. A. O. manpower and to get uniform administration, some Congressmen advocate a central board made up of representatives of the services, the War Production Board, and the Comptroller General.

The board would determine policy, draw up general rules, and review contested cases. Actual settlement would be handled by procurement officers of the various services. If O. W. M.'s new unit takes hold fast, Congress may make it the central board.

Procurement officers say that Congress also will have to give them a specific grant of authority to make advance payments on termination settlements. (Debate over whether the services had the power to make advance payments was one of the main things that held up adoption of the uniform termination clause for Government contracts.)

SEEK PERMISSIVE AUTHORITY

Although the services believe in advance payments, they want the grant of authority to be purely permissive, leaving them free to refuse advances in specific cases. Contractors, on the other hand, are pressing Congress to make advance payments mandatory.

The odds are that Congress will try for a compromise on this problem, too. It probably won't make advances compulsory in all cases. But it is pretty sure to set up a system of mandatory loans for small companies and contractors who can show hardship if payment is delayed.

WHICH TO CANCEL?

One problem that Congress can't handle, except in a general way, is the question of which contracts should be canceled and when. From the contractor's standpoint, this is one of the most important points of all.

If the Office of War Management's new unit can handle the job, it may get most of the responsibility for drawing up an overall termination program. A good many other agencies—the services, War Production Board, the Office of Civilian Requirements—would like the job, but the chances are that a central coordinating agency, like the Office of War Management, will come out with final authority.

FAST WORK NEEDED

Whichever outfit handles termination policy, it won't have long to plan its program. Present production schedules call for a net reduction in the number of Government contractors, beginning in the first quarter of 1944.

If Germany collapses next year, the war program, now set for \$76,000,000,000 next year, will be cut back to an annual rate of about \$40,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000, possibly even less.

In any case, most of the eliminations of contractors from the program will come before the end of the war, either by expiration or by cancellation.

SIX BILLIONS CANCELED

Dollar volume of contracts canceled has passed the impressive total of \$6,000,000,000, more than the value of all contracts terminated at the end of the last war.

But most of them haven't been hard to handle. About three-quarters of the cancellations to date have involved no claim against the Government, because they were incident to the placing of a new contract.

Settlements have been slow, averaging around 8 months. One reason for this is that contractors are busy with other war work and don't get around to filing claims.

SPEED-UP DUE

Even so, procurement officers admit that they will have to step up the whole procedure within the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think Business Week's suggested solution solves the problem. The Budget and Accounting Act intended for the Comptroller General to do the very job that Business Week suggests that Jimmie Byrnes or some

other executive department of the Government will do.

I hope that my joint resolution will be adopted and that the Comptroller General will be the executive agent of Congress to audit these contracts.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes after the other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] for 10 minutes.

PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Petroleum Administration for War goes merrily on with its program of refinery expansion and gasoline restriction. Mr. Ralph Davies, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, is head of the Petroleum Administration for War, and he is assisted by representatives of many other major oil companies. The Petroleum Administration for War is authorizing the building of new refineries and the junking of presently existing and operating plants.

Down in Louisiana and in other southern and western States the Government is now building or has just completed building new oil refineries, using Government money and credit. It looks on without protest when existing plants now running at capacity, producing high-grade gasoline, for both war and civilian needs, are torn down and destroyed. The Cities Service Oil Co. is about to complete its large new refinery at Lake Charles, La., financed to a large extent, if not entirely, by the Federal Government, and I am glad to see the plant there. At the same time at Bossier City, La., the Louisiana Oil Refining Co. plant, the largest interior refinery in the State of Louisiana, has announced that it will completely close down its plant January 1, 1944. This refinery was built by private capital and has been operated for many years entirely by private capital. It is at this very moment producing efficiently thousands of gallons of gasoline each day to be used for both civilian needs and the war effort.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. As I understand it the Louisiana Refining Co. is a subsidiary of Cities Service.

Mr. BROOKS. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. And the refinery to which the gentleman has referred I understand is presently operating, making gasoline, and is soon to be torn down and moved.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that it has been announced that it will close down January 1, 1944, and will not resume operations.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Is it not a fact that the Petroleum Administration for War is urging increased production of

gasoline and the different products of petroleum that go into the war effort?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct, and I may say to the gentleman, too, that this refinery is located in an area in which there have been two and perhaps three new oil fields discovered within the last few months. Those fields need developing very badly. The oil can be taken out of the ground within 40 miles of that refinery and brought to the refinery and manufactured into refined petroleum for the use of the war effort and the civilian economy of the Nation.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement in view of the fact that we are suffering an increased shortage in refined products to meet our war and civilian economy. Certainly this matter is of so much importance that the attention of the Oil Administrator for War should be called to it, and he should see to it that our present operating refining facilities are not torn down but are operated to increase the output.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman may rest assured that I shall send the Oil Administrator for War a copy of the remarks that I am now making.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, New England is vitally interested in that program. What does Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, say to the gentleman?

Mr. BROOKS. I have dealt with the P. A. W., which is composed of the representatives of the large major refining companies of the United States. They are the ones who are familiar with the situation and are handling it; and they simply tell me that the refinery is going to be closed down on the 1st of January.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it because it is too expensive for them to operate, or is the P. A. W. closing it down?

Mr. BROOKS. No; they indicate that the trouble is a shortage of oil, but the point I am getting over is this: They are building new refineries, financed to a large extent by Government money. On the other hand existing refineries producing petroleum products are being closed down.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me that there ought to be an investigation.

Mr. BROOKS. It seems so to me also.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Can the gentleman advise the House as to the product of gasoline that is coming from this refinery?

Mr. BROOKS. It is 87-octane gasoline. It is the kind of gasoline that you use in your motorcar today. In fact, it is superior to that which you are using today in Washington in your motorcar.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Of course, 100-octane gasoline is one of the prod-

ucts which we are endeavoring to obtain increased production of and, because of that, our production of so-called premium gasoline is being reduced tremendously, on account of the present activity toward increasing 100-octane gasoline. Is that true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. May I ask the gentleman further: The fact is that this refinery is presently operating in the middle of the oil field; is that true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. The type of crude produced there is sweet crude and so-called sour crude, is it not?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Does the gentleman know whether or not this particular refinery has refining facilities to run sour crude?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think it has refining facilities to run sour crude, some of which is produced in the gentleman's district. I will say this, the refinery has been there operating, to my certain knowledge, for over 20 years, operating entirely on private funds. In the midst of a great war when we need refined petroleum and petroleum products more than we have ever needed them, they proceed to close down this refinery and to divert oil that is being consumed by this refinery hundreds of miles south.

I might say incidentally that the Government is now financing a pipe line to come from Houston by way of Lake Charles and pick up this same oil that is produced in my territory and in the gentleman's territory and bring it back within 40 miles of that refinery, on its way east.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Is it not a fact that the Government could extend the facilities of the present refinery for the production of byproducts from crude petroleum much cheaper and more economically than it could by constructing new refineries?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. Had the P. A. W. seen fit to enlarge that plant and put in a 100-octane unit, the products from that plant might have been consumed within 5 miles of that refinery by Army bases in that area.

I am informed that the process of tearing down this refinery has already begun, and that material is now being moved away. On the one hand is a refinery financed by the taxpayers of the Nation just being completed, and on the other hand is one privately financed and privately operated which is about to be torn down and junked.

I have received letters from many of the employees of the Louisiana Oil Refinery at Bossier City, La., who have told me that they have already been informed of the termination of their jobs. They have been urged to sell their homes where they have lived for many years and move to a distant point, accepting a new job. They do not want to move in the midst of a great war to a new community unless it is absolutely necessary in order to win this war.

Mr. Speaker, the situation I have portrayed to you arises in my own State. This is not the only instance, however, where new plants have been built and financed by the Government under the guise of the war effort, putting out of business privately built and operated plants. At the very time when there is a most acute shortage of critical materials and when high-grade steel is worth almost its weight in gold, millions of tons of materials vitally needed in the war effort have been uselessly consumed. The labor of thousands of our workers has been uselessly expended. Inconvenience, dislocation, and confusion has been caused by moving employees from one place to another from their homes to work at distant plants. The Petroleum Administration for War, headed by such men as Mr. Davies and other high officials in the major oil companies, must know that the day of reckoning is ahead. They must know that they cannot justify the building of new plants, Federally financed, in time of war, and the destroying of existing plants built with private capital and badly needed in the war effort.

In the meantime, the shortage of gasoline becomes more acute, and private business and industry of the Nation suffer almost to the point of extinction by the existing shortage of refined petroleum products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

KENNETH M. GRUENNERT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I recently read the citation which accompanied the posthumous award of a medal of honor to Kenneth E. Gruennert, an American sergeant of Infantry, for an act of supreme bravery near Buna, New Guinea. It impressed me once more with the special quality of individual heroism which our ground troops are called upon to display in this terrible war.

I confess that I feel a great sense of humility when I consider the almost unbelievable courage with which our soldiers are overcoming a ruthless and cunning enemy on battlefields all over the world. And I believe their deeds affect other Members of this House.

I mention Sergeant Gruennert's name because I know what he did. He advanced alone on hostile Japanese pillboxes which were holding up his platoon and put two of them out of action with grenades and his rifle before he was killed by snipers. For this display of conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action above and beyond the call of duty our highest decoration was awarded.

In their daily contacts with the enemy thousands of our infantrymen are performing acts, strictly in the line of duty, which call for such bravery under fire that they have raised the basic definition of a doughboy's duty to a very high level of courage, indeed.

Although I am informed that the basic principles of warfare do not change,

they are being applied quite differently in this war from the tactics of a quarter century ago. Instead of great, unwieldy armies, locked in trenches, we have small, highly mobile forces with mobile firepower. The maneuverability of today's artillery and its swift accessibility to any point of resistance requires the dispersal of men to minimize losses. Defense becomes a matter of small pockets of strength whose destruction will not cause the collapse of an entire position. Offensive is equally the advance of small, dispersed units, heavily armed.

This new type of warfare has put a heavy responsibility on the individual infantryman. He is a member of a combat team and he has been schooled in its maneuvers. But the success of the combat team in battle often depends upon the initiative of its individual members.

Hard training has made the infantryman a master of individual, personal combat, and I should think that this, more than anything else, has given him the superb self-confidence which permits his incredible feats of heroism. His mastery of surprise, his training in concealment, and in advancing without exposing himself to fire have given him an assurance which makes him simply unbeatable in the field.

You must feel, as I do, an excited admiration for these fine young Americans. Wherever I am I find that I cannot help but talk about them, trying to impress others here at home with what is happening on the roads, in the hills, and in the jungles overseas. There is something very inspiring in the realization that these men are conquering an enemy who has been taught that war is a natural way of life. There is something very reassuring in the knowledge that these men, nurtured in liberty, are taking the measure of legions toughened in a philosophy of slavery.

As an American I take deep pride in these accomplishments. There was a time when some of us wondered if the pioneer's strength, which had made our Nation great, was ebbing away on the soft tide of civilization. These men are the answer to that. These men, superbly armed, superbly conditioned, superbly trained as fighters. These men who, like Sergeant Gruennert, are not afraid to die if death is the price of victory. These infantrymen who fight with their weapons, with their hands, and with their hearts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a newspaper report of Mrs. Roosevelt's visit overseas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. MOTT (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. MAAS (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. IZAC (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. STEAGALL (at the request of Mr. STARNES of Alabama), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 11 a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 1288, H. R. 3428, and H. R. 2641, and such other matters as may come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a hearing Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

874. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

875. A letter from the Chief, Division of Budget and Accounts, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 for the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for "General Administration, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

876. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting the information with respect to the number of persons needed for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

877. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting a revised copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the Quarter ending December 31, 1943, covering regular operations of the Office of Civilian Defense; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

878. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a copy of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the second quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

879. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

880. A letter from the War Food Administrator, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 330. Resolution for the consideration of S. 763, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 789). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Second interim report pursuant to House Resolution 30, Seventy-eighth Congress. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 2616. A bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 399. A bill for the relief of John Sims; with amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Gawalls; with amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1760. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten; with amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Nadine Gorman; with amendment (Rept. No. 796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Tom S. Steed; without amendment (Rept. No. 797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2792. A bill for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis; with amendment (Rept. No. 800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3512. A bill providing for the relief of contractors' employees on Wake Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3513 (by request). A bill to amend section 1313 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3514 (by request). A bill to liberalize the definition of widow of a veteran of World War 1 and World War 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3515 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3516 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the Schedule of Disability Ratings, 1925, as amended, and make same applicable to ratings of veterans of World War 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3517 (by request). A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3518. A bill to facilitate the termination financing of war-production contracts of the Department of the Navy and subcontracts thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 3519. A bill to extend the excess-profits-tax exemption relating to strategic minerals to income attributable to the mining of fluorspar and the production of hydrofluoric acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3520. A bill to provide adjustments in the retirement classification and pay of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3521. A bill to give veterans preferential rights to purchase "jeeps" and other military vehicles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3522. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3523. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors or of other subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3524. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3526 (by request). A bill to amend section 33 of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 28, 1934; to

the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3525 (by request). A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of death compensation benefits to widows and children of World War veterans under Public No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 3527. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3528. A bill to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3529. A bill to provide for loans to enable veterans of World War No. 2 to pay debts existing at the date of their discharge from the service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3530. A bill to authorize the construction and extension of certain marine hospitals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LECOMPT:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to suspend the provisions of the law relating to compulsory retirement for age of officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 49. Congressional resolution to enable members of the armed services to vote by absentee ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 331. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 332. Resolution recognizing the invalidity of Executive Orders No. 9001 and 9023 dated December 27, 1941, and January 16, 1942, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. Res. 333. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1649; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3531. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Russell H. Quynn, Lieutenant commander, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3533. A bill for the relief of Ernest H. West; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of George S. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Billie Stooksberry and Lon L. Stooksberry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3536. A bill for the relief of H. A. Wilson, W. B. Conner, and Charles E. Hilliard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Bessie Eason; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3538. A bill for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan, to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3539. A bill for the relief of Carlos Manuel Perez Silva and Nilda Concepcion Ramos Perez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3540. A bill granting a pension to Oscar O. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3151. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Frank Tims, of Waxahachie, Tex., favoring House bill 3396; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3152. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Petition signed by Rev. Victor Hourez, pastor, and 55 members and friends of the Second Four Square Church of Long Beach, Calif., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3153. Also, petition signed by 60 members of the Bethany Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Rev. Earl J. Edwards is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3154. Also, letter from Rev. Herbert C. Tweedie, pastor of the Community Presbyterian Church of Long Beach, Calif., and petitions signed by 38 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3155. Also, letter received from Mrs. Georgia S. Zimmerman, director of religious education, Lynwood Methodist Church, Lynwood, Calif., and petitions signed by 31 members of that church, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3156. Also, petition signed by Rev. J. T. Kraft, pastor of the Lutheran Church of Long Beach, Calif., and 36 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3157. Also, petition signed by Rev. Louis R. Lee, pastor of the Baptist Evangelistic Church of Compton, Calif., and 28 members of his congregation, urging the passage of House bill 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3158. Also, petition signed by Rev. William Harvey Beard, pastor of the West Side Church of Christ of Compton, Calif., and 43 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3159. Also, petition signed by 184 members of the First Methodist Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Dr. George W. McDonald is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3160. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. John Farabee, of Joliet, Ill., and 24 citizens, urging early favorable consideration of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3161. By Mr. MAHON: Petition signed by J. J. Atkinson, N. W. Allphin, and 105 other residents of Lynn County, Tex., urging passage of House bill 836; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3162. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of May Hukill and others of Carthage, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Wagner-Murray bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3163. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolutions of the Michigan Petroleum Association, relative to supply and distribution of petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3164. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of E. S. Perrine and others, of Taney County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3165. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Bertha Junk Darby and nine other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3166. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of North Charleston, W. Va., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3167. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Newspaper Guild of St. Louis, Mo., signed by 754 workers in the mechanical, commercial, and editorial departments of the St. Louis Metropolitan Newspaper, strongly urging the passage of proper legislation providing for subsidies as recommended by the President feeling that such subsidies will play a part in halting inflation and enabling a roll-back of prices to the September 1942 level. They further urge the passage of such legislation in the interest of maintaining a sound domestic economy and decent living standards; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3168. Also, petition of E. J. Eskilson and 46 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3169. Also, petition of R. M. Renz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3170. Also, petition of Henry H. Berberich and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3171. Also, petition of George Kiburz and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks

to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3172. Also, petition of W. R. Stogsdill and 218 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3173. Also, petition of Mary Withum and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3174. Also, petition of Oliver M. Openthaler and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3175. Also, petition of William R. Hays and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3176. Also, petition of S. R. Nelson and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3177. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Ruedlinger and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3178. Also, petition of W. J. Dracopoulos, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3179. Also, petition of T. J. Dracopoulos, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3180. Also, petition of the Continental Baking Co., of Washington, D. C., and signed by 72 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3181. Also, petition of the Covered Wagon, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3182. Also, petition of the Elks Club, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 47 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3183. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. John P. Blum, of Puyallup, Wash., and 110 others, urging that to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, Congress should prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States of America for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization and, therefore, requesting Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Mr. Bryson, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3184. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Mrs. A. J. Abing, of Blissfield, Mich., and signed by 31 other residents of the community, urging the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3185. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 196 residents of Brunswick, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; requesting Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; and requesting that the petition be referred to the proper

committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3186. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Clara B. Mead, of Pomona, Calif., and 17 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3187. Also, petition, of Maude E. Remington, of Pomona, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3188. Also, petition of Martha Davis, of Pomona, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3189. Also, petition of Jennie B. Wilferth, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3190. Also, petition of Helen W. Macfarland, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3191. Also, petition of Shick MacDonald, of Alhambra, Calif., and nine others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3192. Also, petition of Mary J. Hill, of Monrovia, Calif., and 34 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3193. Also, petition of Birdie J. Wright, of Alhambra, Calif., and 19 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3194. Also, petition of Pearl M. Boileau, of Pomona, Calif., and 20 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3195. Also, petition of Olive S. Persons, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3196. Also, petition of Hattie M. Cannon, of Pomona, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3197. Also, petition of Harry G. Earle, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3198. Also, petition of M. E. Bridgeford, of Pomona, Calif., and seven others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3199. Also, petition of Clara M. Lee, of Pomona, Calif., and four others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3200. Also, petition of E. B. Brand, of Ontario, Calif., and six others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3201. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Strehlon, of Hollywood, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3202. Also, petition of C. C. Nevins, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3203. Also, petition of G. W. Mack, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3204. Also, petition of Irene V. Arnold, of Monterey Park, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3205. Also, petition of Mrs. James Wheatley, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3206. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy Schubarth, of Pomona, Calif., and nine others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3207. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy P. Duffield, Jr., of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others,

urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3208. Also, petition of Lila Lusher, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3209. Also, petition of Alice S. Spencer, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3210. Also, petition of Mrs. Frankie Mae Patch, of Arcadia, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3211. Also, petition of Mrs. L. S. MacDougall, of Arcadia, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3212. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Russell, of Arcadia, Calif., and 18 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3213. Also, petition of Rev. E. B. Hager, of Monrovia, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3214. Also, petition of Moses Breeze, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3215. Also, petition of Wilma Freeman, of Arcadia, Calif., and 16 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3216. Also, petition of Mrs. J. C. Baldwin, of Arcadia, Calif., and 23 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3217. Also, petition of Martha Riford, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3218. Also, petition of Birdie J. Wright, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3219. Also, petition of Evla M. Walker, of Monterey Park, Calif., and five others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3220. Also, petition of Peter Beck, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3221. Also, petition of John M. Kephart, of Wilmar, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3222. Also, petition of Roselma B. Riggs, of Garvey, Calif., and 68 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3223. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3224. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Celia B. Zaner and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3225. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution by the subcommittee of the California guayule rubber committee, at San Francisco, Calif., recommending that the Rubber Reserve Corporation contract for the production and purchase of guayule and that the present

emergency rubber project of the United States Department of Agriculture be made the agent of the Rubber Reserve Corporation to represent them in making such contracts, and that a price be determined for the delivery of rubber produced from the guayule shrub at the end of 1, 2, 3, 4, or other agreed number of years, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3226. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of Hon. Francis D. Culkin; to the Committee on Memorials.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O faithful Shepherd who dost neither slumber nor sleep, we are the people of Thy pasture and the sheep of Thy hand; in Thy will is our freedom; Thy rod and Thy staff comfort and keep us. Until Thou, good Shepherd, dost capture our hearts, wandering without direction on the plains of peril, we mistake the license which enslaves for the liberty which makes free indeed.

We would remember that other sheep Thou hast which are not of our fold. For all Thy people hasten the day of deliverance, when there shall be one shepherd and one fold in a common unity against the wolves of want and fear, tyranny and exploitation. May we so guard the treasures of our freedom, bought with a great cost, that we will not allow the fight for freedom to destroy the freedom for which we fight. May the crimson threads of today's fearful sacrifice be woven into the very fabric of society in a fairer pattern of opportunity and equality for all. We ask it in the Saviour's Name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1943.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.